Monday,
30th July, 1956

LOK SABHA DEBATES

VOLUME V, 1956

(16th July to 10th August 1956

THIRTEENTH SESSION, 1956

LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI

CONTENTS

(Vol. V, Nos. 1—20—16th July to 10th August, 1956).

	COLUMNS
No. 1. *Monday, 16th July, 1956.*	
Member Sworn.....	1
Oral Answers to Questions—	
Starred Questions Nos. 1, 3 to 8, 10 to 12, 14 to 21, 23 to 25, 27, 29 to 31 .	1—29
Written Answers to Questions—	
Starred Questions Nos. 2, 9, 13, 22, 28, 32 to 34.	30—33
Unstarred Questions Nos. 1 to 22, 24, 25	33—44
Daily Digest	45—46
No. 2. *Tuesday, 17th July, 1956.*	
Oral Answers to Questions—	
Starred Questions Nos. 35, 39, 41, 42, 44 to 50, 52 to 57, 60 and 61 . .	47—75
Written Answers to Questions—	
Starred Questions Nos. 36 to 38, 40, 43, 51, 58, 59, 62 to 67 . . .	75—80
Unstarred Questions Nos. 26 to 59	80—96
Daily Digest	97—100
No. 3. *Wednesday, 18th July 1956.*	
Oral Answers to Questions—	
Starred Questions Nos. 68, 69, 71 to 74, 76, 78, 80, 82, 83, 85, 86, 88, 90 to 93, 96 to 99	101—29
Written Answers to Questions —	
Starred Questions Nos. 70, 75, 77, 79, 81, 84, 87, 89, 94, 95, 100 to 113, 115 to 128	129—44
Unstarred Questions Nos. 60 to 81, 83	144—52
Correction of Answer to Starred Question—	152—54
Daily Digest	155—58
No. 4. *Friday, 20th July, 1956.*	
Oral Answers to Questions—	
Starred Questions Nos. 129 to 132, 134, 136 to 138, 140, 141, 143, 147, 153, 156, 157, 135, 139	
Written Answers to Questions—	
Starred Questions Nos. 133, 144 to 146, 148, 149, 154, 155, 15	
Unstarred Questions Nos. 84 to 101	
Daily Digest	
No. 5. *Saturday, 21st July, 1956.*	
Oral Answers to Questions—	
Starred Questions Nos. 159 to 167, 169, 171, 172, 174 to 176, 180 to 186 .	203—31
Short Notice Question No. 1	231—35
Written Answers to Questions—	
Starred Questions Nos. 168, 170, 173, 177, 178, 187 to 196	235—40
Unstarred Questions Nos. 102 to 130	240—56
Daily Digest	257—60

No. 6. *Tuesday, 24th July, 1956.* COLUMNS

Oral Answers to Questions—

Starred Questions Nos. 197 to 202, 204 to 206, 208, 209 212, 213. 216 to 227, 215, 210 . . . . . 261—91

Written Answers to Questions—

Starred Questions Nos. 203, 207, 211, 214. . . . . 291—93

Unstarred Questions Nos. 131 to 139 . . . . . 293—98

Daily Digest . . . . . 299—300

No. 7. *Wednesday, 25th July, 1956.*

Oral Answers to Questions—

Starred Questions Nos. 228 to 242, 244 to 252, 254 and 255 . . . 301—30

Written Answers to Questions—

Starred Questions Nos. 243, 253, 256 to 286 . . . . . 330—42

Unstarred Questions Nos. 140 to 176 . . . . . 352—58

Daily Digest . . . . . 359—62

No. 8. *Thursday, 26th July, 1956.*

Oral Answers to Questions—

Starred Questions Nos. 287 to 292, 294 to 298, 300 to 302, 304 to 311, 314 363—91

Written Answers to Questions—

Starred Questions Nos. 293, 299, 303, 312, 313, 315 to 339, 341 . . 391—404

Unstarred Questions Nos. 177 to 210 . . . . . 404—16

Daily Digest . . . . . 417—20

No. 9. *Friday, 27th July, 1956.*

Oral Answers to Questions—

Starred Questions Nos. 342, 344, 346 to 348, 354, 374, 349 to 353, 355, 356, 358, 359, 361 and 362 . . . . . 421—45

Short Notice Questions Nos. 2 to 4 . . . . . 445—57

Written Answers to Questions—

Starred Questions Nos. 343, 345, 357, 360, 364 to 373, 375 to 382, 384 to 393 . . . . . 457—70

Unstarred Questions Nos. 212 to 240 . . . . . 470—82

Daily Digest . . . . . 483—86

No. 10. *Saturday, 28th July, 1956.*

Oral Answers to Questions—

Starred Questions Nos. 396, 398 to 400, 402 to 406, 408, 411, 412, 415, 417, 418, 420, 421, 423, 426, 429, 431, 432, 435, 436 . . . . . 487—515

Short Notice Question No. 5 . . . . . 515—18

Written Answers to Questions—

Starred Questions Nos. 394, 395, 397, 401, 407, 409, 410, 413, 414, 416, 419, 424, 425, 428, 430, 433, 434, 437, 438 to 447 . . . . . 518—29

Unstarred Questions Nos. 241 to 261 . . . . . 529—38

Daily Digest . . . . . 539—40

	COLUMNS
No. 11. *Monday, 30th July, 1956.*	
Oral Answers to Questions—	
Starred Questions Nos. 451 to 454, 456 to 460, 462, 463, 466, 468, 469, 471 to 477, 479, 480	541—69
Written Answers to Questions—	
Starred Questions Nos. 448 to 450, 455, 461, 464, 465, 467, 470, 478, 481 to 500	569—82
Unstarred Questions Nos. 262 to 296	582—98
Daily Digest	599—602
No. 12. *Tuesday, 31st July, 1956.*	
Oral Answers to Questions—	
Starred Questions Nos. 505 to 509, 511 to 522, 525, 528, 529, 531, 534 to 536	603—32
Written Answers to Questions—	
Starred Questions Nos. 501 to 504, 510, 523, 524, 526, 527, 530, 532, 533, 537 to 539, 541 to 557	632—44
Unstarred Questions Nos. 297 to 336	644—58
Daily Digest	659—74
No. 13. *Wednesday, 1st August, 1956.*	
Oral Answers to Questions—	
Starred Questions Nos. 560, 561, 563 to 565, 567, 568, 571, 573 to 577, 579, 580	675—91
Written Answers to Questions—	
Starred Questions Nos. 558, 559, 562, 566, 569, 570, 572, 578, 581 to 598, 600 to 606, 608 and 609	691—703
Unstarred Questions Nos. 337 to 351	704—10
Daily Digest	711—12
No. 14. *Thursday, 2nd August, 1956.*	
Oral Answers to Questions—	
Starred Questions Nos. 611, 613 to 617, 619 to 624, 626 to 629, 631 to 634, 637, 638, 640 to 642, 644	713—40
Written Answers to Questions—	
Starred Questions Nos. 610, 612, 618, 625, 630, 635, 636, 639, 643, 645 to 672	740—56
Unstarred Questions Nos. 352 to 382	756—70
Daily Digest	771—74
No. 15. *Friday, 3rd August, 1956.*	
Oral Answers to Questions—	
Starred Questions Nos. 673 to 678, 680, 682 to 684, 686, 687, 690, 691, 693, 695 to 698, 701 to 705	775—803
Written Answers to Questions—	
Starred Questions Nos. 679, 681, 685, 688, 689, 692, 694, 700, 706 to 721	803—12
Unstarred Questions Nos. 383 to 412 and 414	812—26
Daily Digest	827—30
No. 16. *Monday, 6th August, 1956.*	
Oral Answers to Questions—	
Starred Questions Nos. 722 to 727, 729 to 733, 735 to 737, 741 to 743, 746, 748 to 750.	831—58
Short Notice Question No. 6	858—5
Written Answers to Questions—	
Starred Questions Nos. 728, 734, 738 to 740, 745, 747, 751 to 755, 757 to 776, 778 to 780, 782, 783.	860—7
Unstarred Questions Nos. 415 to 439, 441 to 443	874—8
Daily Digest	887—90

No. 17. *Tuesday, 7th August,* 1956. COLUMNS

Oral Answers to Questions—
Starred Questions Nos. 784, 786, 787, 789, 790, 792 to 797, 799 to 803, 805 806, 808 to 810 . . . . . 851—917
Short Notice Question No. 7 917
Written Answers to Questions—
Starred Questions Nos. 785, 788, 791, 798, 804, 807, 811 to 836, 838 to 847 . 918—34
Unstarred Questions Nos. 444 to 486, 488 to 494 . . . . . 934—57
Daily Digest . . . . . 957—60

No. 18. *Wednesday, 8th August,* 1956.

Oral Answers to Questions—
Starred Questions Nos. 848 to 867, 869, 870 . . . . 961—88
Written Answers to Questions—
Starred Questions Nos. 868, 871 to 893 . . . . 988—97
Unstarred Questions Nos. 495 to 529 . . . . 997—1012
Daily Digest . . . . . 1013—16

No. 19. *Thursday, 9th August,* 1956.

Oral Answers to Questions—
Starred Questions Nos. 894, 896 to 900, 903, 905 to 907, 909, 914, 915, 918, 921 to 923, 925 to 931 . . . . . 1017—44
Written Answers to Questions—
Starred Questions Nos. 895, 901, 902, 904, 908, 910 to 913, 916, 917, 919, 920, 924, 932 to 942 . . . . . 1044—52
Unstarred Questions Nos. 530 to 553 . . . . . 1052—62
Daily Digest . . . . . 1063—64

No. 20. *Friday,* 10*th August,* 1956.

Oral Answers to Questions—
Starred Questions Nos. 944 to 947, 949, 950, 953 to 957, 959 to 964, 966, 984, 967, 968 . . . . . 1065—93
Short Notice Question No. 8 1093
Written Answers to Questions—
Starred Questions Nos. 943, 948, 951, 952, 958, 965, 969 to 983, 985 to 993 . 1094—1104
Unstarred Questions Nos. 554 to 603 . . . . . 1104—27
Daily Digest . . . . . 1127—30
Index . . . . . I—172

LOK SABHA

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS

A

Abdullabhai, Mulla Taherali Mulla (Chanda).

Abdus Sattar, Shri (Kalna-Katwa).

Achal Singh, Seth [Agra Distt. (West)].

Achalu, Shri Sunkam (Nalgonda—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

Achint Ram, Lala (Hissar).

Achuthan, Shri K. T. (Crangannur).

Agarawal, Shri Hoti Lal [Jalaun Distt. *cum* Etawah Distt.—(West) *cum* Jhansi Distt.—(North)].

Agrawal, Shri Mukund Lal [Pilibhit Distt. *cum* Bareilly Distt.—(East)].

Ajit Singh, Shri (Kapurthala-Bhatinda—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

Ajit Singhji, General (Sirohi-Pali).

Akarpuri, Sardar Teja Singh (Gurdaspur).

Alagesan, Shri O. V. (Chingleput).

Altekar, Shri Ganesh Sadashiv (North Satara).

Alva, Shri Joachim (Kanara).

Amin, Dr. Indubhai B. (Baroda West).

Amjad Ali, Shri (Goalpara-Garo Hills).

Amrit Kaur, Rajkumari (Mandi-Mahasu).

Anandchand, Shri (Bilaspur).

Ansari, Dr. Shaukatullah Shah (Bidar).

Anthony, Shri Frank (Nominated—Anglo-Indians).

Asthana, Shri Sita Rama (Azamgarh Distt.—West).

Ayyangar, Shri M. Ananthasayanam (Tirupati).

Azad, Maulana Abul Kalam (Rampur Distt. *cum* Bareilly Distt.—West).

Azad, Shri Bhagwat Jha (Purnea *cum* Santhal Parganas).

B

Babunath Singh, Shri (Surguja-Raigarh—Reserved—Sch. Tribes).

Badam Singh, Chowdhary (Budaun Distt.—West).

Bagdi, Shri Magan Lal (Mahasamund).

Bahadur Singh, Shri (Ferozepore-Ludhiana—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

Balakrishnan, Shri S. C. (Erode—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

Balasubramaniam, Shri S. (Madurai).

Baldev Singh, Sardar (Nawan Shahr).

Balmiki, Shri Kanhaiya Lal (Bulandshah Distt.—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

Banerjee, Shri Durga Charan (Midnapore-Jhargram).

Bansal, Shri Ghamandi Lal (Jhajjar-Rewari).

Bansilal, Shri (Jaipur).

Barman, Shri Upendranath (North Bengal—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

Barrow, Shri A. E. T. (Nominated—Anglo-Indians).

Barupal, Shri Panna Lall (Ganganagar-Jhunjhunu—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

Basappa, Shri C. R. (Tumkur).

Basu, Shri A. K. (North Bengal).

Basu, Shri Kamal Kumar (Diamond Harbour).

Bhagat, Shri B. R. (Patna *cum* Shahabad).

Bhakt Darshan, Shri [Garhwal Distt.—(East) *cum* Moradabad Distt.—(North-East)]

Bharati, Shri Goswamiraja Sahdeo (Yeotmal).

Bhargava, Pandit Mukat Behari Lal (Ajmer South).

Bhargava, Pandit Thakur Das (Gurgaon).

Bhartiya, Shri Shaligram Ramchandra (West Khandesh).

Bhatkar, Shri Laxman Shrawan (Buldana-Akola—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

B—*contd.*

Bhatt, Shri Chandrashanker (Broach).

Bhawani Singh, Shri (Barmer-Jalore).

Bhawanji, Shri (Kutch West).

Bheekha Bhai, Shri (Banswara—Dungarpur—Reserved—Sch. Tribes).

Bhonsle, Shri Jagannathrao Krishna Rao (Ratnagiri North).

Bidari, Shri Ramappa Balappa (Bijapur South).

Birbal Singh, Shri [Jaunpur Distt.—(East)].

Biren Dutt, Shri (Tripura West).

Bogawat, Shri U. R. (Ahmednagar South).

Boovaraghasamy, Shri V. (Perambalur).

Borkar, Shrimati Anusayabai (Bhandara—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

Borooah, Shri Dev Kanta (Nowgong).

Bose, Shri P. C. (Manbhum North).

Brajeshwar Prasad, Shri (Gaya East).

Brohmo-Chaudhury, Shri Sitanath (Goalpara-Garo Hills—Reserved—Sch. Tribes).

Buchhikotaiah, Shri Sanaka (Masulipatnam).

C

Chakravartty, Shrimati Renu (Basirhat).

Chaliha, Shri Bimalaprosad (Sibsagar—North-Lakhimpur).

Chanda, Shri Anil Kumar (Birbhum).

Chandak, Shri B. L. (Betul).

Chandrasekhar, Shrimati M. (Tiruvallur—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

Charak, Th. Lakshman Singh (Jammu and Kashmir).

Chatterjea, Shri Tushar (Serampore).

Chatterjee, Dr. Susilranjan (West Dinajpur).

Chatterjee, Shri N. C. (Hooghly).

Chattopadhyaya, Shri Harindranath (Vijayavada).

Chaturvedi, Shri Rohanlal [Etah Distt.—(Central)].

Chaudhary, Shri Ganeshi Lal [Shahjahanpur Distt.—(North) *cum* Kheri—(East)—Reserved—Sch. Castes].

Chaudhuri, Shri Tridib Kumar (Berhampore).

Chavda, Shri Akbar (Banaskantha).

Chettiar, Shri N. Vr. N. Ar. Nagappa (Ramanathapuram).

Chettiar, Shri T. S. Avinashilingam (Tiruppur).

Chowdary, Shri C. R. (Narasaraopet).

Chowdhury, Shri Nikunja Behari (Ghatal).

D

Dabhi, Shri Fulsinhji B. (Kaira North).

Damar, Shri Amar Singh Sabji (Jhabua—Reserved—Sch. Tribes).

Damodaran, Shri G. R. (Pollachi).

Damodaran, Shri Nettur P. (Tellicherry).

Das, Dr. Mono Mohon (Burdwan—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

Das, Shri B. (Jaipur-Keonjhar).

Das, Shri Basanta Kumar (Contai).

Das, Shri Beli Ram (Barpeta).

Das, Shri Bijoy Chandra (Ganjam South).

Das, Shri Kamal Krishna (Birbhum—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

Das, Shri Nayan Tara (Monghyr Sadr *cum* Jamui—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

Das, Shri Ram Dhani (Gaya East.—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

Das, Shri Ramananda (Barrackpore).

Das, Shri Sarangadhar (Dhenkanal-V Cuttack).

Das, Shri Shree Narayan (Darbhanga Central)

Dasaratha Deb, Shri (Tripura East).

Datar, Shri Balwant Nagesh (Belgaum North).

Deb, Shri Suresh Chandra (Cachar-Lushai Hills).

Deo, H. H. Maharaja Rajendra Narayan Singh (Kalahandi-Bolangir).

Deogam, Shri Kanhu Ram (Chaibassa—Reserved—Sch. Tribes).

Desai, Shri Kanayalal Nanabhai (Surat).

Desai, Shri Khandubhai Kasanji (Halar).

Deshmukh, Dr. Panjabrao S. (Amravati East).

D—*contd.*

Deshmukh, Shri Chintaman Dwarkanath (Kolaba).

Deshmukh, Shri K. G. (Amravati West).

Deshpande, Shri Govind Hari (Nasik Central).

Deshpande, Shri Vishnu Ghanashyam (Guna).

Dholakia, Shri Gulab Shankar Amritlal (Kutch East).

Dhulekar, Shri R. V. [Jhansi Distt.—(South)].

Dhusiya, Shri Sohan Lal (Basti Distt.—(Central-East) *cum* Gorakhpur Distt.—(West)—Reserved—Sch. Caste].

Digambar Singh, Shri (Etah Distt.—(West *cum* Mainpuri Distt.—(West) *cum* Mathura Distt.—(East)].

Diwan, Shri Raghavendrarao Srinivasrao (Osmanabad).

Dube, Shri Mulchand [Farrukhabad Distt. (North)].

Dube, Shri Udai Shankar [Basti Distt. (North)].

Dubey, Shri Rajaram Giridharlal (Bijapur North).

Dutt, Shri Asim Krishna (Calcutta South-West).

Dutta, Shri Santosh Kumar (Howrah).

Dwivedi, Shri Dashrath Prasad (Gorakhpur Distt.—Central).

Dwivedi, Shri M. L. (Hamirpur Distt.).

E

Eacharan, Shri Iyyunni (Ponnani—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

Ebenezer, Dr. S. A. (Vikarabad).

Elayaperumal, Shri L. (Cuddalore—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

F

Fotedar, Pandit Sheo Narayan (Jammu and Kashmir).

G

Gadgil, Shri Narhar Vishnu (Poona Central)

Gadilingana Gowd, Shri (Kurnool).

Gami Mailudora, Shri (Visakhapatnam—Reserved—Sch. Tribes).

Gandhi, Shri Feroze [Pratapgarh Distt. (West) *cum* Rae Bareli Distt. (East)].

Gandhi, Shri Maneklal Maganlal (Panch Mahals *cum* Baroda East).

Gandhi, Shri V. B. (Bombay City—North).

Ganga Devi, Shrimati (Lucknow Distt. *cum* Bara Banki Distt.—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

Ganpati Ram, Shri [Jaunpur Distt. (East)—Reserved—Sch. Castes)].

Garg, Shri Ram Pratap (Patiala).

Gautam, Shri C. D. (Balaghat).

Ghose, Shri Surendra Mohan (Malda).

Ghosh, Shri Atulya (Burdwan).

Ghulam Qader, Shri (Jammu and Kashmir).

Gidwani, Shri Choithram Partabrai (Thana)

Giri, Shri V. V. (Pathapatnam).

Giridhari Bhoi, Shri (Kalahandi-Bolangir) Reserved—Sch. Tribes).

Gohain, Shri Chowkhamoon (Nominated—Assam Tribal Areas).

Gopalan, Shri A. K. (Cannanore).

Gopi Ram, Shri (Mandi-Mahasu—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

Gounder, Shri K. Periaswami (Erode).

Gounder, Shri K. [Sakthivadivel (Periyakulam).

Govind Das, Seth (Mandla-Jabalpur South).

Guha, Shri Arun Chandra (Santipur).

Gupta, Shri Badshah (Mainpuri Distt.—East).

Gupta, Shri Sadhan Chandra (Calcutta—South—East).

Gurupadaswamy, Shri M. S. (Mysore).

H

Hansda, Shri Benjamin (Purnea *cum* Santa Parganas—Reserved—Sch. Tribes).

Hari Mohan, Dr. (Manbhum North—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

Hasda, Shri Subodh (Midnapore-Jhargram—Reserved—Sch. Tribes).

H—*contd.*

Hazarika, Shri Jogendra Nath (Dibrugarh).

Heda, Shri H. C. (Nizamabad).

Hembrom, Shri Lal (Santal Parganas *cum* Hazaribagh—Reserved—Sch. Tribes).

Hem Raj, Shri (Kangra).

Hukam Singh, Sardar (Kapurthala-Bhatinda).

Hyder Husein, Chaudhri (Gonda Distt.—North).

I

Ibrahim, Shri A. (Ranchi North-East).

Iqbal Singh, Sardar (Fazilka-Sirsa).

Islamuddin, Shri Muhammad (Purnea—North-East).

Iyyunni, Shri C. R. (Trichur).

J

Jagjivan Ram, Shri (Shahabad South—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

Jain, Shri Ajit Prasad (Saharanpur Distt.—West *cum* Muzaffarnagar Distt.—North).

Jain, Shri Nemi Saran (Bijnor Distt.—South).

Jaipal Singh, Shri (Ranchi West—Reserve d—Sch. Tribes).

aisoorya, Dr. N. M. (Medak).

ajware, Shri Ramraj (Santal Parganas *cum* Hazaribagh).

Jangde, Shri Resham Lal (Bilaspur—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

Jatav-vir, Dr. Manik Chand (Bharatpur-Sawai Madhopur—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

Jayaraman, Shri A. (Tindivanam—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

Jayashri, Shrimati (Bombay-Suburban).

Jena, Shri Kanhu Charan (Balasore—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

Jena, Shri Lakshmidhar (Jaipur-Keonjhar—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

Jena, Shri Niranjan (Dhenkanal-West Cuttack—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

ethan, Shri Kherwar (Palamau *cum* Hazaribagh *cum* Ranchi—Reserved—Sch. Tribes).

Jhunjhunwala, Shri Banarsi Prasad (Bhagalpur Central).

Jogendra Singh, Sardar (Bahraich Distt.—West).

Joshi, Shri Anand Chandra (Shahdol-Sidhi).

Joshi, Shri Jethalal Harikrishna (Madhya Saurashtra).

Joshi, Shri Krishnacharya (Yadgir).

Joshi, Shri Liladhar (Shajapur-Rajgarh).

Joshi, Shri Moreshwar Dinkar (Ratnagiri South).

Joshi, Shri Nandlal (Indore).

Joshi, Shrimati Subhadra (Karnal).

Jwala Prashad, Shri (Ajmer North).

K

Kachiroyar, Shri N. D. Govindaswami (Cuddalore).

Kajrolkar, Shri Narayan Sadoba (Bombay City—North—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

Kakkan, Shri P. (Madurai—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

Kale, Shrimati Anasuyabai (Nagpur).

Kamal Singh, Shri (Shahabad—North-West).

Kamath, Shri Hari Vishnu (Hoshangabad).

Kamble, Dr. Devrao Nambevrao (Nanded—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

Kandasamy, Shri S. K. Babie (Tiruchengode).

Kanungo, Shri Nityanand (Kendrapara).

Karmarkar, Shri D. P. (Dharwar North).

Karni Singhji, His Highness Maharaja Shri Bahadur of Bikaner (Bikaner-Churu).

Kasliwal, Shri Nemi Chandra (Kotah-Jhalawar).

Katham, Shri Birendranath (North Bengal—Reserved—Sch. Tribes).

Katju, Dr. Kailas Nath (Mandsaur).

Kayal, Shri Paresh Nath (Basirhat—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

Kazmi, Shri Syed Mohammad Ahmad (Sultanpur Distt.—North *cum* Faizabad Distt.—South-West).

Kelappan, Shri K. (Ponnani).

Keshavaiengar, Shri N. (Bangalore North).

K—*contd.*

Keskar, Dr. B. V. (Sultanpur Distt.—South).

Khan, Shri Sadath Ali (Ibrahimpatnam).

Khardekar, Shri B. H. (Kolhapur *cum* Satara).

Khare, Dr. N. B. (Gwalior).

Khedkar, Shri Gopalrao Bajirao (Buldana. Akola).

Khongmen, Shrimati B. (Autonomous Distts. —Reserved—Sch. Tribes).

Khuda Baksh, Shri Muhammed (Murshidabad).

Kirolikar, Shri Wasudeo Shridhar (Durg).

Kolay, Shri Jagannath (Bankura).

Kottukappally, Shri George Thomas (Meenachil).

Kripalani, Acharya J. B. (Bhagalpur *cum* Purnea).

Krishna, Shri M. R. (Karimnagar—Reserved —Sch. Castes).

Krishna Chandra, Shri (Mathura Distt.— West).

Krishnamachari, Shri T. T. (Madras).

Krishnappa, Shri M. V. (Kolar).

Krishnaswami, Dr. A. (Kancheepuram).

Kureel, Shri Baij Nath (Pratapgarh Distt.— West *cum* Rae Bareli Distt.—East—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

Kureel, Shri Piare Lal (Banda Distt. *cum* Fatehpur Distt.—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

L

Lakshmayya, Shri Paidi (Anantapur).

Lal Singh, Sardar (Ferozepur-Ludhiana).

Lallanji, Shri (Faizabad Distt.—North-West).

Laskar, Shri Nibaran Chandra (Cachar-Lushai Hills—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

Lingam, Shri N. M. (Coimbatore).

Lotan Ram, Shri (Jalaun Distt. *cum* Etawah Distt.—West *cum* Jhansi Distt.—North—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

M

Madiah Gowda, Shri (Bangalore South).

Mahapatra, Shri Sibnarayan Singh (Sundargarh—Reserved—Sch. Tribes).

Mahata, Shri Bhajaharf (Manbhum South *cum* Dhalbhum).

Mahodaya, Shri Vaijanath (Nimar).

Maitra, Shri Mohit Kumar(Culcutta—North West).

Majhi, Shri Chaitan (Manbhum—South *cum* Dhalbhum—Reserved—Sch. Tribes).

Majhi, Shri Ram Chandra (Mayurbhanj—Reserved—Sch. Tribes).

Majithia, Sardar Surjit Singh (Taran Taran).

Malaviya, Shri Keshava Deva (Gonda Distt.— East *cum* Basti Distt.— West).

Malliah, Shri U. Srinivasa (South Kanara—North).

Malvia, Shri Bhagu-Nandu (Shajapur-Rajgarh —Reserved—Sch. Castes).

Malviya, Pandit Chatur Narain (Raisen).

Malviya, Shri Motilal (Chhatarpur-Datia-Tikamgarh—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

Mandal, Dr. Pashupati (Bankura—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

Mascarene, Kumari Annie (Trivandrum).

Masuodi, Maulana Mohammad Saeed (Jammu and Kashmir).

Masuriya Din, Shri (Allahabad Distt.— East *cum* Jaunpur Distt.—West—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

Mathew, Shri C. P. (Kottayam).

Mathuram, Dr. Edward Paul (Tiruchirapalli).

Matthen, Shri C. P. (Thiruvellah).

Mavalankar, Shrimati Sushila (Ahmedabad

Maydeo, Shrimati Indira A. (Poona South).

Mehta, Shri Asoka (Bhandara).

Mehta, Shri Balvantray Gopaljee (Gohilwad).

Mehta, Shri Balwant Sinha (Udaipur).

Mehta, Shri Jaswantraj (Jodhpur).

Menon, Shri K. A. Damodara (Kozhikode).

Minimata, Shrimati (Bilaspur-Durg-Raipur —Reserved—Sch. Castes).

Mishra, Pandit Suresh Chandra (Monghyr North-East).

Mishra, Shri Bibhuti (Saran *cum* Champaran).

Mishra, Shri Lalit Narayan (Darbhanga *cum* Bhagalpur).

M—*contd.*

Mishra, Shri Lokenath (Puri).

Mishra, Shri Mathura Prasad (Monghyr—North-West).

Mishra, Shri Shyam Nandan (Darbhanga—North).

Misra, Pandit Lingaraj (Khurda).

Misra, Shri Bhupendra Nath (Bilaspur-Durg-Raipur).

Misra, Shri Raghubar Dayal (Bulandshahr Distt.).

Misra, Shri Sarju Prasad (Deoria Distt.—South).

Missir, Shri Vijineshwar (Gaya North).

Mohd. Akbar, Sofi (Jammu and Kashmir).

Mohiuddin, Shri Ahmed (Hyderabad City).

Morarka, Shri Radheshyam Ramkumar (Ganganagar-Jhunjhunu).

More, Shri K. L. (Kolhapur *cum* Satara—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

More, Shri Shankar Shantaram (Sholapur)

Muchaki Kosa, Shri (Bastar—Reserved—Sch. Tribes).

Mudaliar, Shri C. Ramaswamy (Kumbakonam).

Muhammed Shafee, Chaudhuri (Jammu and Kashmir).

Mukerjee, Shri Hirendra Nath (Calcutta—North-East).

Mukne, Shri Y. M. (Thana—Reserved—Sch. Tribes).

Muniswamy, Shri N. R. (Wandiwash).

Muniswamy, Shri V. (Tindivanam).

Murli Manohar, Shri (Ballia Distt. East).

Murthy, Shri B. S. (Eluru).

Musafir, Giani Gurmukh Singh (Amritsar).

Mushar, Shri Kirai (Bhagalpur *cum* Purnea—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

Muthukrishnan, Shri M. (Vellore—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

N

Naidu, Shri Nalla Reddi (Rajahmundry).

Nair, Shri C. Krishnan (Outer Delhi).

Nair, Shri N. Sreekantan (Quilon *cum* Mavelikkara).

Nambiar, Shri K. Ananda (Mayuram).

Nanadas, Shri Mangalagiri (Ongole—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

Nanda, Shri Gulzarilal (Sabarkantha).

Narasimham, Shri S. V. L. (Guntur).

Narasimhan, Shri C. R. (Krishnagiri).

Naskar, Shri Purnendu Sekhar (Diamond Harbour—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

Natawadkar, Shri Jayantrao Ganpat (West Khandesh—Reserved—Sch. Tribes).

Nathani, Shri Hari Ram (Bhilwara).

Nathwani, Shri Narendra P. (Sorath).

Nayar, Shri V. P. (Chirayinkil).

Nehru, Shri Jawaharlal (Allahabad Distt.—East *cum* Jaunpur Distt.—West).

Nehru, Shrimati Shivraj Vati (Lucknow Distt.—Central)

Nehru, Shrimati Uma (Sitapur Distt. *cum* Kheri Distt.—West).

Nesamony, Shri A. (Nagercoil).

Neswi, Shri T. R. (Dharwar—South).

Nevatia, Shri R. P. (Sahjahanpur Distt.—North *cum* Kheri—East).

Nijalingappa, Shri S. (Chitaldrug).

P

Palchoudhury, Shrimati Ila (Nabadwip).

Pande, Shri Badri Dutt (Almora Distt.—North—East).

Pande, Shri C. D. (Naini Tal Distt. *cum* Almora Distt.—South-West *cum* Bareilly Distt.—North).

Pandey, Dr. Natabar (Sambalpur).

Pannalal, Shri (Faizabad Distt.—North-West—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

Paragi Lal, Chaudhari (Sitapur Distt. *cum* Kheri Distt.—West—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

Paranjpe, Shri R. G. (Bhir).

Parekh, Dr. Jayantilal Narbheram (Zalawad).

Parikh, Shri Shantilal Girdharilal (Mehsana East).

P—*contd.*

Parmar, Shri Rupaji Bhavji (Panch Mahals *cum* Baroda East—Reserved—Sch. Tribes).

Pataskar, Shri Hari Vinayak (Jalgaon).

patel, Shri Bahadurbhai Kunthabhai (Surat —Reserved—Sch. Tribes).

Patel, Shri Rajeshwar (Muzaffarpur *cum* Darbhanga).

Patel, Shrimati Maniben Vallabhbhai (Kaira South).

Pateria, Shri Sushil Kumar (Jabalpur North).

Patil, Shri P. R. Kanavade (Ahmednagar North).

Patil, Shri S. K. (Bombay City—South).

Patil, Shri Shankargauda Veeranagauda (Belgaum South).

Patnaik, Shri Uma Charan (Ghumsur).

Pawar, Shri Vyankatrao Pirajirao (South Satara).

Pillai, Shri P. T. Thanu (Tirunelveli).

Pocker Saheb, Shri B. (Malaopuram).

Prabhakar, Shri Naval (Outer Delhi—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

Punnoose, Shri P. T. (Allenney).

R

Rachiah, Shri N. (Mysore—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

Radha Raman, Shri (Delhi City).

Raghavachari, Shri K. S. (Penukonda).

Raghavaiah, Shri Pisupati Vekata (Ongole).

Raghubir Sahai, Shri (Etah Distt.—North-East *cum* Budaun Distt—East).

Raghubir Singh, Choudhary (Agra Distt.—East).

Raghunath Singh, Shri (Banaras Distt.—Central).

Raghuramaiah, Shri Kotha (Tenali).

Rahman, Shri M. Hifzur (Moradabad Distt.—Central).

Raj Bahadur, Shri (Jaipur-Sawai Madhopur).

Rajabhoj, Shri P. N. (Sholapur— Reserved —Sch. Castes).

Ramachander, Dr. D. (Vellore).

Ramanand Shastri, Swami (Unnao Distt. *cum* Rae Bareli Distt.—West *cum* Hardoi-Distt.—South-East—Reserved—Sch. Castes)

Ramananda Tirtha, Swami (Gulberga).

Ramasami, Shri M. D. (Arruppukkottai).

Ramaseshaiah, Shri N. (Parvathipuram).

Ramaswamy, Shri P. (Mahbubnagar—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

Ramaswamy, Shri S. V. (Salem).

Ram Dass, Shri (Hoshiarpur—Reserved —Sch. Castes).

Ram Krishan, Shri (Mohindergarh).

Ramnarayan Singh, Babu (Hazaribagh West).

Ram Saran, Shri (Moradabad Distt.—West).

Ram Shankar Lal, Shri (Basti Distt.—Central-East *cum* Gorakhpur Distt.—West).

Ram Subhag Singh, Dr. (Shahabad South)

Ranbir Singh, Ch. (Rohtak).

Randaman Singh, Shri (Shahdol-Sidhi —Reserved—Sch. Tribes).

Rane, Shri Shivram Rango (Bhusaval).

Ranjit Singh, Shri (Sangrur).

Rao, Dr. Ch. V. Rama (Kakinada).

Rao, Shri B. Rajagopala (Srikakulam).

Rao, Shri B. Shiva (South Kanara—South)

Rao, Shri Kadyala Gopala (Gudivada).

Rao, Shri Konety Mohana (Rajahmundry —Reserved—Sch. Castes).

Rao, Shri Kondru Subba (Eluru—Reserved —Sch. Castes).

Rao, Shri P. Subba (Nowrangpur).

Rao, Shri Pendyal Raghava (Warangal).

Rao, Shri Rayasam Seshagiri (Nandyal).

Rao, Shri T. B. Vittal (Khammam).

Raut, Shri Bhola (Saran *cum* Champaran —Reserved—Sch. Castes).

Ray, Shri Birakisor (Cuttack).

Razmi, Shri Said Ullah Khan (Sehore).

R—*contd.*

Reddi, Shri B. Ramachandra (Nellore).

Reddi, Shri C. Madhao (Adilabad).

Reddi, Shri Y. Eswara (Cuddapah).

Reddy, Shri Baddam Yella (Karimnagar).

Reddy, Shri K. Janardhan (Mahbubnagar).

Reddy, Shri Ravi Narayan (Nalgonda).

Reddy, Shri T. N. Vishwanatha (Chittoor).

Richardson, Bishop John (Nominated—Andaman and Nicobar Islands).

Rishang Keishing, Shri (Outer Manipur —Reserved—Sch. Tribes).

Roy, Dr. Satyaban (Uluberia).

Roy, Shri Bishwa Nath (Deoria Distt. —West).

Rup Narain, Shri (Mirzapur Distt. *cum* Banaras Distt.—West—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

S

Sahaya, Shri Syamnandan (Muzaffarpur Central).

Sahu, Shri Bhagabat (Balasore).

Sahu, Shri Rameshwar (Muzaffarpur *cum* Darbhanga—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

Saigal, Sardar Amar Singh (Bilaspur).

Saksena, Shri Mohanlal (Lucknow Distt. *cum* Bara Banki Distt.).

Samanta, Shri Satis Chandra (Tamluk).

Sanganna, Shri T. (Rayagada-Phulbani—Reserved—Sch. Tribes).

Sankarapandian, Shri M. (Sankaranayinarkovil).

Sarma, Shri Debendra Nath (Gauhati).

Sarmah, Shri Debeswar (Golaghat-Jorhat).

Satish Chandra, Shri (Bareilly Distt. South).

Satyawadi, Dr. Virendra Kumar (Karnal —Reserved—Sch. Castes).

Sen, Shri Phani Gopal (Purnea Central).

Sen, Shri Raj Chandra (Kotah-Bundi).

Sen, Shrimati Sushama (Bhagalpur South).

Sewal, Shri A. R. (Chamba-Sirmur).

Shah, Her Highness Rajmata Kamlendu Mati (Garhwal Distt.—West *cum* Tehri Garhwal Distt. *cum* Bijnor Distt.—North.)

Shah, Shri Chimanlal Chakubhai (Gohilwad-Sorath).

Shah, Shri Raichand Bhai N. (Chhindwara).

Shahnawaz Khan, Shri (Meerut Distt. —North-East).

Shakuntala Nayar, Shrimati (Gonda Distt. —West).

Sharma, Pandit Balkrishna (Kanpur Distt. —South *cum* Etawah Distt.—East).

Sharma, Pandit Krishna Chandra (Meerut Distt.—South).

Sharma, Shri Diwan Chand (Hoshiarpur).

Sharma, Shri Khushi Ram (Meerut Distt. —West).

Sharma, Shri Nand Lal (Sikar).

Sharma, Shri Radha Charan (Morena-Bhind).

Shastri, Shri Algu Rai (Azamgarh Distt. —East *cum* Ballia Distt.—West).

Shastri, Shri Raja Ram (Kanpur Distt—Central).

Shivananjappa, Shri M. K. (Mandya).

Shobha Ram, Shri (Alwar).

Shriman Narayan, Shri (Wardha).

Shukla, Pandit Bhagwaticharan (Durg-Bastar).

Siddananjappa, Shri H. (Hassan Chikmagalur).

Singh, Shri C. Sharan (Surguja-Raigarh).

Singh, Shri Digvijaya Narain (Muzaffarpur —North-East).

Singh, Shri Dinesh Pratap (Bahraich Distt.—East).

Singh, Shri Girraj Saran (Bharatpur-Sawai Madhopur).

Singh, Shri Har Prasad (Ghazipur Distt. —West).

Singh, Shri L. Jogeswar (Inner Manipur).

Singh, Shri Mahendra Nath (Saran Central).

Singh, Shri Ram Nagina (Ghazipur Distt. —East *cum* Ballia Distt.—South-West).

S—*contd.*

Singh, Shri Tribhuan Narayan (Banaras Distt.—East).

Singhal, Shri Shri Chand (Aligarh Distt.)

Sinha, Dr. Satyanarain (Saran East).

Sinha, Shri Anirudha (Darbhanga East)

Sinha, Shri Awadheshwar Prasad (Muzaffarpur East).

Sinha, Shri Banarsi Prasad (Monghyr Sadr *cum* Jamui).

Sinha, Shri Gajendra Prasad (Palamau *cum* Hazaribagh *cum* Ranchi).

Sinha, Shri Jhulan (Saran North).

Sinha, Shri Kailash Pati (Patna Central).

Sinha, Shri Nageshwar Prasad (Hazaribagh East).

Sinha, Shri S. (Pataliputra).

Sinha, Shri Satya Narayan (Samastipur East).

Sinha, Shri Satyendra Narayan (Gaya West).

Sinha, Shrimati Tarkeshwari (Patna East)

Sinha, Thakur Jugal Kishore (Muzaffarpur—North-West).

Sinhasan Singh, Shri (Gorakhpur Distt.—South).

Siva, Dr. M. V. Gangadhara (Chittoor—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

Snatak, Shri Nardeo (Aligarh Distt.—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

Sodhia, Shri Khub Chand (Sagar).

Somana, Shri N. (Coorg).

Somani, Shri G. D. (Nagaur-Pali).

Subrahamanyam, Shri Kandala (Vizianagaram).

Subrahmanyam, Shri Tekur (Bellary).

Subramania Chettiar, Shri (Dharmapuri).

Sundaram, Dr. Lanka (Visakhapatnam).

Sunder Lall, Shri (Saharanpur Distt.—West *cum* Muzaffarnagar Distt.—North—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

Suresh Chandra, Dr. (Aurangabad).

Suriya Prashad, Shri (Morena-Bhind—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

Swami, Shri Sivamurthi (Kushtagi).

Swaminadhan, Shrimati Ammu (Dindigul).

Syed Mahmud, Dr. (Champaran East).

T

Tandon, Shri Purushottamdas [Allahabad Distt. (West)].

Tek Chand, Shri (Ambala-Simla).

Telkikar, Shri Shankar Rao (Nanded).

Tewari, Sardar Raj Bhanu Singh (Rewa).

Thimmaiah, Shri Dodda (Kolar—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

Thirani, Shri G. D. (Bargarh).

Thomas, Shri A. M. (Ernakulam).

Thomas, Shri A. V. (Srivaikuntam).

Tivary, Shri Venkatesh Narayan (Kanpur Distt.—North *cum* Farrukhabad Distt.—South).

Tiwari, Pandit B. L. (Nimar).

Tiwari, Shri Ram Sahai (Chhatarpur-Datia-Tikamgarh).

Tiwary, Pandit Dwarka Nath (Saran South).

Tripathi, Shri Hira Vallabh (Muzaffarnagar Distt.—South).

Tripathi, Shri Kamakhya Prasad (Darrang).

Tripathi, Shri Vishwambhar Dayal (Unnao Distt. *cum* Rae Bareli Distt.—West *cum* Hardoi Distt.—South-East).

Trivedi, Shri Umashanker Mulji bha (Chittor).

Tulsidas Kilachand, Shri (Mehsana West).

Tyagi, Shri Mahavir (Dehra Dun Distt. *cum* Bijnor Distt.—North-West *cum* Saharanpur Distt.—West).

U

Uikey, Shri M. G. (Mandla-Jabalpur—South—Reserved—Sch. Tribes).

Upadhyay, Pandit Munishwar Dutt (Partapgarh Distt.—East).

Upadhyay, Shri Shiva Dayal (Banda Distt *cum* Fatehpur Distt.).

Upadhyaya, Shri Shiva Datt (Satna).

V

Vaishnav, Shri Hanamantrao Ganeshrao (Ambad).

Vaishya, Shri Muldas Bhuderdas (Ahmedabad—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

Vallatharas, Shri K. M. (Pudukkottai).

Varma, Shri B. B. (Champaran North).

Varma, Shri Manik Lal (Tonk).

Veeraswamy, Shri V. (Mayuram—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

Velayudhan, Shri R. (Quilon *cum* Mavelikkara—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

Venkataraman, Shri R. (Tanjore).

Verma, Shri Bulaqi Ram (Hardoi Distt.—North-West *cum* Farrukhabad Distt.—East *cum* Shahjahanpur Distt.—South—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

Verma, Shri Ramji (Deoria Distt.—East).

Vidyalankar, Shri Amarnath (Jullundur).

Vishwanath Prasad, Shri (Azamgarh Distt.—West—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

Vyas, Shri Radhelal (Ujjain).

W

Waghmare, Shri Narayan Rao (Parbhani).

Wilson, Shri J. N. (Mirzapur Distt. *cum* Banaras Distt.—West).

Wodeyar, Shri K. G. (Shimoga).

Z

Zaidi, Col. B. H. (Hardoi Distt.—North-West *cum* Farrukhabad Distt.—East *cum* Shahjahanpur Distt.—South).

LOK SABHA

The Speaker

Shri M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar.

The Deputy-Speaker

Sardar Hukam Singh.

Panel of Chairmen

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava.
Shri K. S. Raghavachari.
Shri Upendranath Barman.
Shri Frank Anthony.
Shrimati Renu Chakravartty.
Shrimati Sushama Sen.

Secretary

Shri M. N. Kaul, Barrister-at-Law.

Business Advisory Committee

Shri M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar. (*Chairman*)
Sardar Hukam Singh.
Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava.
Shrimati Renu Chakravartty.
Shri Satya Narayan Sinha.
Shri A. M. Thomas.
Shri Narhar Vishnu Gadgil.
Shri Nageshwar Prasad Sinha.
Shri Dev Kanta Borooah.
Shri M. L. Dwivedi.
Shri Raghubir Sahai.
Shri Asoka Mehta.
Shri B. Ramachandra Reddi.
Shri Uma Charan Patnaik.
Shri Jaipal Singh.

Committee of Privileges

Sardar Hukam Singh. (*Chairman*)
Shri Hari Vinayak Pataskar.
Shri Satya Narayan Sinha.
Pandit Munishwar Dutt Upadhyay.
Shri Dev Kanta Borooah.
Shri R. Venkataraman.
Shri Tekur Subrahmanyam.
Shri Nemi Chandra Kasliwal.
Shri A. K. Gopalan.
Shri J. B. Kripalani.
Shri S. S. More.
Shri Frank Anthony.
Shri Nemi Saran Jain.
Shri Ram Sahai Tiwari.
Shri Lakshman Singh Charak.

Committee on Absence of Members from the sittings of the House

Shri Ganesh Sadashiv Altekar. (*Chairman*)
Shri Ganeshi Lal Chaudhary.
Shri Ram Shankar Lal.
Shri B. L. Chandak.
Shri Paidi Lakshmayya.
Shri Mahendra Nath Singh.
Shri Shivram Rango Rane.
Shri Fulsinhji B. Dabhi.
Shri Bhagwat Jha 'Azad'.
Shri Ram Dass.
Shri U. M. Trivedi.
Shrimati Kamlendu Mati Shah.
Shri C. R. Chowdary.
Shri K. M. Vallatharas.
Shri Vijneshwar Missir.

Committee on Assurances

Shri K. S. Raghavachari. (*Chairman*)
Shri Jaswantraj Mehta.
Shri T. B. Vittal Rao.
Shri K. A. Damodara Menon.
Shri A. E. T. Barrow.
Shri Anirudha Sinha.
Shri Radha Charan Sharma.
Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha.
Pandit Krishna Chandra Sharma.
Shri C. P. Matthen.
Sardar Iqbal Singh.
Shri Basant Kumar Das.
Shri Bhupendra Nath Misra.
Shri R. Venkataraman.
Pandit Lingaraj Misra.

Committee on Offices of Profit

Lok Sabha

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava. (*Chairman*)
Shri V. B. Gandhi.
Shri S. V. Ramaswamy.
Shri K. Raghuramaiah.
Shri Vishambhar Dayal Tripathi.
Shri R. V. Dhulekar.
Shri Anirudha Sinha.
Shri S. S. More.
Shri Kamal Kumar Basu.
Shri N. Ramaseshaiah.

Rajya Sabha

Shri M. Govinda Reddy.
Kazi Karimuddin.
Shri Amolakh Chand.
Prof. G. Ranga.
Shri Rajendra Pratap Sinha.

Committee on Petitions

Shri Kotha Raghuramaiah. (*Chairman*)
Shri Shiva Datt Upadhyaya.
Shri K. T. Achuthan.
Shri Sohan Lal Dhusiya.
Shri S. C. Deb.
Shri Liladhar Joshi.
Shri U. R. Bogawat.
Shri Jethalal Harikrishna Joshi.
Shri Ramraj Jajware.
Shri Resham Lal Jangde.
Shri P. N. Rajabhoj.
Shri P. Subba Rao.
Shri Anandchand.
Dr. Ch. V. Rama Rao.
Shri Ramji Verma.

Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions

Sardar Hukam Singh. (*Chairman*)
Shri Raghunath Singh.
Shri Nageshwar Prasad Sinha.
Shri Ganesh Sadashiv Altekar.
Shri Goswamiraja Sahdeo Bharati.
Shri Narendra P. Nathwani.
Shri Radheshyam Ramkumar Morarka.
Shrimati Ila Palchoudhuri.
Shri N. Rachiah.
Dr. Natabar Pandey.
Shri Bhawani Singh.
Shri T. B. Vittal Rao.
Shri C. Madhao Reddi.
Shri N. Sreekantan Nair.
Shri Rayasam Seshagiri Rao.

Committee on Subordinate Legislation

Shri N. C. Chatterjee. (*Chairman*)
Shri S. V. Ramaswamy.
Shri N. M. Lingam.
Shri A. Ibrahim.
Shri Hanamantrao Ganeshrao Vaishnav.
Shri Tek Chand.
Shri Ganpati Ram.
Shri Nandlal Joshi.
Shri Diwan Chand Sharma.
Shri Hem Raj.
Shri H. Sid dananjappa.
Dr. A Krishnaswami.
Shri Tulsidas Kilachand.
Shri Hirendra Nath Mukerjee.
Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy.

Estimates Committee

Shri Balvantray Gopaljee Mehta. (*Chairman*)
Shri B. S. Murthy.
Shrimati B. Khongmen.
Shri Nageshwar Prasad Sinha.
Shri B. L. Chandak.
Shri Amarnath Vidyalankar.
Shri Venkatesh Narayan Tivary.
Shri Satis Chandra Samanta.
Shri Raghavendrarao Srinivasrao Diwan.
Shri M. R. Krishna.
Shri Jethalal Harikrishna Joshi.
Shri Bhawani Singh.
Shri P. Subba Rao.
Shri P. N. Rajabhoj.
Shri Vishnu Ghanashyam Deshpande.
Shri Satyendra Narayan Sinha.
Pandit Dwarka Nath Tiwary.
Shri C. R. Narasimhan.
Shri Raghubir Sahai.
Pandit Algu Rai Shastri.
Shri Abdus Sattar.
Shri Lakshman Singh Charak.
Shri N. Rachiah.
Shri Radheshyam Ramkumar Morarka.
Shri Mangalagiri Nanadas.
Shri T. B. Vittal Rao.
Shri Y. Gadilingana Gowd.
Shri Jaswantraj Mehta.
Shri A. E. T. Barrow.
Shri Choithram Partabrai Gidwani.

General Purposes Committee

Shri M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar (*Chairman*)
Sardar Hukam Singh.
Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava.
Shri Upendra Nath Barman.
Shri Frank Anthony.
Shrimati Renu Chakravartty.
Shrimati Sushama Sen.
Shri K. S. Raghavachari.
Shri B. G. Mehta.
Shri V. B. Gandhi.
Shri Satya Naryan Sinha.
Shri N. C. Chatterjee.
Shri Kotha Raghuramaiah.
Shri G. S. Altekar.
Shri U. S. Malliah.
Shri A. K. Gopalan.
Shri Tulsidas Kilachand.
Shri J. B. Kripalani.

Shri Uma Charan Patnaik.
Dr. A. Krishnaswami.

House Committee

Shri U. Srinivasa Malliah (*Chairman*)
Shri Birbal Singh.
Shri Radha Charan Sharma.
Shri George Thomas Kottukapally.
Shri Digvijaya Narain Singh.
Shri Krishnacharya Joshi.
Shri N. Somana.
Shri Bhupendra Nath Misra.
Shri N. D. Govindaswami Kachiroyar.
Shri Raj Chandra Sen.
Shri K. Ananda Nambiar.
Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy.

Joint Committee on Salaries and Allowances of Members of Parliament

Lok Sabha

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha. (*Chairman*)
Shri Bhagwat Jha 'Azad'.
Shri U. Srinivasa Malliah.
Shri Diwan Chand Sharma.
Shri Jagan Nath Kolay.
Shri G. H. Deshpande.
Shri Nemi Chandra Kasliwal.
Shri N. C. Chatterjee.
Shri P. T. Punnoose.
Shri Asoka Mehta.

Rajya Sabha

Shri H. C. Dasappa.
Shri D. Narayana.
Shri R. P. N. Sinha.
Shrimati Chandravati Lakhanpal.
Shri V. K. Dhage.

Library Committee

Lok Sabha

Sardar Hukam Singh. (*Chairman*)
Shri V. N. Tivary.
Shri M. L. Dwivedi.
Shri U. C. Patnaik.
Shri M. D. Joshi.
Shri H. N. Mukerjee.

Rajya Sabha

Shri R. D. 'Dinkar' Sinha.
Shri Theodre Bodra.
Shrimati Lilavati Munshi.

Public Accounts Committee

Lok Sabha

Shri V. B. Gandhi. (*Chairman*)
Shri K. G. Deshmukh.
Shri U. Srinivasa Malliah.
Shri Diwan Chand Sharma.
Shri C. D. Pande.
Shri Kamal Kumar Basu.
Shri V. Boovaraghasamy.
Dr. Indubhai B. Amin.
Shri Nibaran Chandra Laskar.
Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha.
Shri Tribhuan Narayan Singh.
Shri Radhelal Vyas.
Shri C. P. Matthen.
Shri J. B. Kripalani.
Shrimati Shakuntala Nayar.

Rajya Sabha

Shri G. Ranga.
Shri R. M. Deshmukh.
Shrimati Pushpalata Das.
Shri Shyam Dhar Misra.
Shri P. T. Leuva.
Shri B. C. Ghose.
Shri J. V. K. Vallabharao.

Rules Committee

Shri M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar. (*Chairman*)
Sardar Hukam Singh.
Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava.
Shri Satya Narayan Sinha.
Shri N. Keshavaiengar.
Shri Shivram Rango Rane.
Shri Ghamandi Lal Bansal.
Shri Khushi Ram Sharma.
Shri Kotha Raghuramaiah.
Shri Satis Chandra Samanta.
Dr. N. M. Jaisoorya.
Shri N. C. Chatterjee.
Shri Bhawani Singh.
Shri Kamal Kumar Basu.
Shri K. S. Raghavachari.

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

Members of the Cabinet

Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs and also in charge of the Department of Atomic Energy—Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.

Minister of Education and National Resources and Scientific Research—Maulana Abul Kalam Azad.

Minister of Home Affairs—Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant.

Minister of Communications—Shri Jagjivan Ram.

Minister of Health—Rajkumari Amrit Kaur.

Minister of Finance—Shri C. D. Deshmukh.

Minister of Planning and Irrigation and Power—Shri Gulzarilal Nanda.

Minister of Defence—Dr. Kailas Nath Katju.

Minister of Commerce and Industry and Iron and Steel—Shri T. T. Krishnamachari.

Minister of Law and Minority Affairs—Shri C. C. Biswas.

Minister of Railways and Transport—Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri.

Minister of Works, Housing and Supply—Sardar Swaran Singh.

Minister of Production—Shri K. C. Reddy.

Minister of Food and Agriculture—Shri Ajit Prasad Jain.

Minister of Labour—Shri Khandubhai Desai.

Minister without Portfolio—Shri V. K. Krishna Menon.

Ministers of Cabinet Rank (but not members of the Cabinet)

Minister of Parliamentary Affairs—Shri Satya Narayan Sinha.

Minister of Defence Organisation—Shri Mahavir Tyagi.

Minister of Information and Broadcasting—Dr. B. V. Keskar.

Minister of Trade—Shri D. P. Karmarkar.

Minister of Agriculture—Dr. Panjabrao S. Deshmukh.

Minister in the Ministry of External Affairs—Dr. Syed Mahmud.

Minister of Legal Affairs—Shri Hari Vinayak Pataskar.

Minister of Natural Resources—Shri K. D. Malaviya.

Minister of Revenue and Civil Expenditure—Shri M. C. Shah.

Minister of Revenue and Defence Expenditure—Shri Arun Chandra Guha.

Minister of Rehabilitation—Shri Mehr Chand Khanna.

Minister of Consumer Industries—Shri Nityanand Kanungo.

Minister in the Ministry of Communications—Shri Raj Bahadur.

Minister in the Ministry of Home Affairs—Shri B. N. Datar.

Minister of Heavy Industries—Shri M. M. Shah.

Deputy Ministers

Deputy Minister of Defence—Sardar S. S. Majithia.

Deputy Minister of Labour—Shri Abid Ali.

Deputy Minister of Rehabilitation—Shri J. K. Bhonsle.

Deputy Minister of Railways and Transport—Shri O. V. Alagesan.

Deputy Minister of Health—Shrimati M. Chandrasekhar.

Deputy Minister of External Affairs—Shri Anil Kumar Chanda.

Deputy Minister of Food and Agriculture—Shri M. V. Krishnappa

Deputy Minister of Irrigation and Power—Shri Jaisukhlal Hathi.

Deputy Minister of Production—Shri Satish Chandra.

Deputy Minister of Planning—Shri Shyam Nandan Mishra.

Deputy Minister of Education—Dr. K. L. Shrimali.

Deputy Minister of Finance—Shri Bali Ram Bhagat.

Deputy Minister of Education—Dr. Mono Mohon Das.

Parliamentary Secretaries]

Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of External Affairs—Shrimati Lakshmi N. Menon.

Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Railways and Transport—Shri Shahnawaz Khan.

Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of External Affairs—Shri Jogendra Nath Hazarika.]

Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Production—Shri Rajaram Giridharlal Dubey.

Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of External Affairs—Shri Sadath Ali Khan.

Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Information and Broadcasting—Shri G. Rajagopalan.

Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Works, Housing and Supply—Shri Purnendu Sekhar Naskar.

LOK SABHA

Monday, 30th July, 1956

The Lok Sabha met at Eleven of the Clock.

[MR. SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

Cost of Living Index

*451. **Shri A. K. Gopalan:** Will the Minister of **Food and Agriculture** be pleased to state:

(a) the cost of living index in the towns of Alleppey, Ernakulam, Quilon, Trivandrum and Trichur for the months of March, April, June and July, 1956;

(b) the rise in the prices of (i) rice, (ii) wheat (iii) kerosene oil and (iv) cloth recorded during these months in those towns;

(c) the steps taken by Government to check the rise in prices; and

(d) the total number of fair price shops opened by Government in that State during the above period?

The Minister of Agriculture (Dr. P.S. Deshmukh): (a) and (b) The required information is placed on the Table of the Lok Sabha. [*See* Appendix III, ann e No. 28].

(c) Fair Price Shops have been opened in selected Centres for distribution of rice at reasonable price. Since wheat is used by only a very small section of the population, the question of opening Fair Price Shops for distribution of wheat does not arise. Regarding kerosene and cloth their present price position does not appear to warrant any Governmental interference.

(d) 134 Fair Price Shops have been opened in the State during this period.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: When the cost of living has gone up, may I know whether it has come to the notice of the Government that the prices of agricultural products especially cocoanuts has gone down?

The Minister of Food and Agriculture (Shri A. P. Jain): The general price index has gone up. But, the price of cocoanut oil has not substantially come down.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: Not cocoanut oil, I said agricultural produce, especially cocoanuts. Cocoanut oil is a different question. I was referring to the price of cocoanuts.

Shri A. P. Jain: There is not much disparity.

Shri A. M. Thomas: How does the cost of living here compare with the all India cost of living index? Is it a fact that while the cost of articles like cocoanuts has gone down, the prices of manuractured articles has gone up in this place?

Shri A. P. Jain: That has been answered.

Shri A. M. Thomas: The first part of the question has not been answered. How does the price index compare with the all India index?

Shri A. P. Jain: I have not got the all India index. We have given the index for Alleppey, Enrakulam, Quilon, Trivandrum and Trichur. The hon. Member can compare with the all India index.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: May I know whether there has been an agitation that the fair prices shops that have been opened in some centres are not sufficient and that more fair price shops should be opened?

Shri A. P. Jain: Yes. We propose to open more fair price shops.

Kumari Annie Mascarene: May I know how the average income of an Indian compare with the cost of living index given here?

Shri A. P. Jain: It is rather a broad question which I cannot answer.

Shri Achuthan: May I know how the price of rice supplied from the fair price shops compares with the market price?

Shri A. P. Jain: In Trichur, the prevailing price of rice is from Rs. 17-8-0 to Rs. 20/-. In Ernakulam it is Rs. 19-4-0 to Rs. 20-4-0. In Alleppey it is 18-8-0 to Rs. 20/-. In Quilon it is Rs. 18-14-0 to Rs. 20-4-0.

In Trivandrum it is Rs. 19-8-0 to Rs. 23/- We are issuing rice from the fair price shops at Rs. 17-8-0.

Shrimati Ammu Swaminadhan: Arising out of Part (b) of the question, may I know if the Government is aware that all over the south, apart from the Kerala State, prices of all household commodities and foodstuffs have gone up enormously during the last two months?

Shri A. P. Jain: I do not think that they have gone up enormously. Certainly they have gone up. We are taking similar steps in a large number of places. We are releasing large quantities of rice in Madras.

"Kashmir Princess"

*452. **Shri Radha Raman:** Will the Minister of **Communications** be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the any People's Republic of China has given any compensation to the Air India international for the losses incurred by them in men and meterial due to the fatal crash of "Kashmir Princess";

(b) if so, the quantum of compensation and conditions, if any, regarding its distribution, and

(c) how the amount so received was actually distributed?

The Minister of Communications (Shri Jagjivan Ram): (a) to (c) . I lay on the table of the Lok Sabha a statement giving the required information. [*See* Appendix III, annexure No. 29].

Shri Radha Raman: May I know what the actual cost of the 'Kashmir Princess' was in the books of the Air India International against which the sum of Rs. 82,375-9-0 is given as compensation?

Shri Jagjiwan Ram: That figure I I have not got here. but this amount is not to compensate the loss of "Kashmir Princess".

Shri Radha Raman: Besides the compensation received from the Government of the Peoples Republic of China,was any other compensation given from the Government of India to the families of the killed or to the survivors in that crash?

Shri Jagjivan Ram: Yes, Sir, I would like to make it clear that the money that has been given by the People's Republic of China is not towards compensation for the loss of Air India International. It is only for the crew who have lost their lives or who were injured in that accident. As regards compensation from us, I have on a former occasion said that apart from the insurance money that they received from the insurer, the Air India International gave *ex gratia* payment to the families of the deceased as well as to the persons surviving. If you will allow me, Sir, I can give the figures again.

Mr. Speaker: A large number of items?

Shri Jagjivan Ram: There are 8 or 9 persons involved.

Mr. Speaker: Total?

Shri Jagjivan Ram : Here are the figures:

	Ex gratia Payment Rs.	Insurance Rs.
Captain Jatar	60,000	27,000
Shri C. V. D'Souza	13,000	15,000
Miss Gloria Berry	20,000	10,000

Mr. Speaker: And so on. Next Question?

Shri M. L. Divedi: May I know....

Rice Milling Clommittee

*453. **Shri Dabhi:** Will the Minister of **Food and Agriculture** be pleased to refer to the reply given to a supplementary raised on Starred Question No. 1247 on the 6th April, 1956 and state:

(a) which of the recommendations of the Rice Milling Committee have been accepted and implemented by Government; and

(b) which of them have have not been accepted; and the reasons there for?

The Minister of Agriculture (Dr. P. S. Deshmukh): (a) The recommendations of the Rice Milling Cimmittee are still under consideration and no final decision has been reached.

(b) Does not arise.

Shri Dabhi: May I know whether it is a fact that the Karve Committee has recommended that no new sheller or combined sheller-huller mills or huller mills or single hullers should be allowed to be set up and no increase in porduction above the present level should be permitted within the Plan period?

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh : I have not got the recommendations of the Karve Committee here.

Shri Ramchandra Reddi: May I know whether any new applications for licences have been granted?

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh: It is possible they may be because the final decision on the recommendations are yet to be taken.

Shri N. B. Chowdhury: May I know whether the views of all the State Governments have been received in respect of all the matters.

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh: Yes, Sir.

Shri Dabhi: Since when is the matter under the consideration of the Government? When was the report submitted?

The Minister of Food and Agriculture (Shri A. P. Jain): The report was submitted in the middle of 1955. It was first sent to the State Governments for their opinion. Then it was sent to the other Ministries for their comments. Then, it was sent to the Planning Commission and then to secretary's Economic Committee. It is now in the final stage of being submitted to the Economic Committee of the Cabinet.

राज्य विधान मंडलों के सदस्यों के लिये मुफ़्त यात्रा की सुविधा

*४५४. **श्री भक्त दर्शन :** क्या रेलवे मंत्री १८ मई, १९५६ के तारांकित प्रश्न संख्या २३२८ के उत्तर के सम्बन्ध में यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) राज्य विधान मंडलों के सदस्यों को रेल पर बिना किराये के यात्रा की सुविधा देने के बारे में जो योजना राज्य सरकारों के पास भेजी गई थी, उस पर राज्य सरकारों की क्या प्रतिक्रिया है और उन्हों ने क्या उत्तर दिये हैं ; और

(ख) क्या उत्तर प्रदेश और आसाम के अतिरिक्त अन्य राज्यों के विधान मंडलों के सदस्यों को भी उन्हीं शर्तों पर ये सुविधायें देने के बारे में विचार किया जा रहा है ?

रेलवे तथा परिवहन मंत्री के संसदीय सचिव (श्री शाहनवाज़ खां) : (क) आसाम और उत्तर प्रदेश सरकार को लिखा गया था। आसाम सरकार ने बतलाया है कि उस ने अभी इस सुझाव पर कोई कार्रवाई न करने का फैसला किया है क्योंकि इस के खर्चे का अनुमान ठीक-ठीक नहीं लगाया जा सकता ।

उत्तर प्रदेश सरकार का जवाब अभी तक नहीं मिला है ।

(ख) जी नहीं ।

Shri Gadilingana Gowd: It may be answered in English because it is a matter of interest for all.

श्री भक्त दर्शन : क्या गवर्नमेंट ने इस बात पर भी विचार किया है कि यदि संसद के सदस्यों के साथ-साथ राज्यों की व्यवस्थापिका सभाओं के सदस्यों को भी निःशुल्क यात्रा की सुविधा दे दी जायेगी तो अन्य यात्रियों के लिये रेलों में शायद कोई जगह भी नहीं रह जायेगी और यदि ऐसा है तो इस के बारे में गवर्नमेंट ने क्या निर्णय किया है ?

श्री शाहनवाज़ खां : जैसे मैं पहले कह चुका हूं यू० पी० और आसाम की सरकारों में से एक ने उत्तर भेज दिया है । जो पार्लियामेंट के मेम्बर्स को सफर करने की सुविधा दी जाती है वह मुफ्त नहीं दी जाती है । बल्कि पार्लियामेंट सेक्रेटेरियेट को उसका खर्चा देना पड़ता है । अगर कोई सरकार अपने मेम्बरों के लिये ऐसी ही सुविधा की मांग करती है, तो उस प्रान्तीय सरकार को उस का खर्चा भी देना पड़ेगा ।

श्री भक्त दर्शन : ऐसा मालूम होता है कि माननीय सभासचिव मेरे प्रश्न को समझे नहीं हैं । मेरा प्रश्न यह था—

The Minister of Railways and Transport (Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri): May I reply?

Mr. Speaker: Yes.

श्री लाल बहादुर शास्त्री : मैं समझता हूं कि पार्लियामेंट के मेम्बर भी जितना कम घूमेंगे उतना ही अच्छा रेलों के लिये होगा । यह ठीक है कि अगर असैम्बलियों के सदस्यों को भी यह सुविधा दे दी गई तो यह एक बहुत बड़ा सवाल हो जायेगा और आजकल जो भीड़ होती है उस में वृद्धि हो सकती है क्योंकि तीन हज़ार या साढ़े तीन हज़ार के करीब असैम्बलियों के सदस्यों को यह सहूलियत सुलभ होगी । मगर मेरा खयाल है कि जिस बुद्धिमानी से और जिस अक्लमन्दी से पार्लियामेंट के मेम्बर घूमते हैं, उतनी ही अक्लमन्दी से दूसरे मेम्बर साहिबान भी घूमेंगे ।

Shri Sadhan Gupta : My I know whether States other then Assam and Uttar Pradesh were addressed in this connection and what their reactions are, particularly whether the State of West Bengal was addressed and the reaction of that State ?

Shri Shahnawaz Khan : The Railway Ministry does not propose to address any State Government on the Subject. It is only the Governments of Uttar Pradesh and Assam themselves who addressed the Railway Ministry.

श्री ब० ब० पांडे : जो विधान सभाओं के सदस्य होंग, क्या उन को राज्य में ही घूमने की अनुमति होगी या वे हिन्दुस्तान भर में घूमेंगे ?

श्री शाहनवाज़ खां : जो मांग पेश की गई है उस के मुताबिक तो वे सूबे के अन्दर अन्दर ही चक्कर लगायेंगे ।

श्री ब० ब० पांडे : क्या वे सरकारें यह समझ रही हैं कि हम लोग मुफ्त में ही घूमते हैं और क्या उन को यह पता नहीं कि हमें भी पैसे देने पड़ते हैं ?

श्री शाहनवाज़ खां : यह उन की ग़लत-फहमी है ।

श्री म० ला० त्रिवेदी : जो सुविधा मेम्बर पार्लियामेंट को प्राप्त है क्या वही सुविधा केन्द्रीय मंत्रालयों के मंत्रियों को भी प्राप्त है, यदि नहीं, तो क्यों नहीं ?

श्री लाल बहादुर शास्त्री : आप ने हम पर यह मेहरबानी नहीं की है । अगर आप लोग कानून बना दें तो हम लोगों को भी यह सुविधा मिल जायेगी ।

Railway Stores

*456. **Shri Madiah Gowda**: Will the Minister of **Railways** be pleased to state:

(a) the number of indents for Railway Stores in Southern Railway pending for more than one year and their value;

(b) the important articles concerned in these delayed indents;

(c) the loss or the inconvenience caused by such delays; and

(d) the steps taken to remedy such delays?

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Railways and Transport (Shri Shahnawaz Khan): (a) 352 indents of a total value of about Rs. 187 lakhs.

(b) to (d). A statement is laid on the Table of the Lok Sabha. [*See* Appendix III, annexure No. 30].

Shri Madiah Gowda: May I know whether such a large percentage of loss due to delay of indents is the peculiarity of only the Southern Railway or is that the case in other railways too?

Shri Shahnawaz Khan: It is common to all railways.

Mr. Speaker: Is it a consolation?

Shri Madiah Gowda: May I know whether they maintain a section kown as Indent Section which follows every indent and sees to it that the indent is expedited?

Shri Shahnawaz Khan: That is the procedure, but due to various difficulties, the stores cannot be supplied. There are various agencies on which indents are placed, but mostly on the Director-General of Supplies and Disposals. They have to import the articles from abroad, and sometimes it is not within their power to make the supplies in time.

Shri Madiah Gowda: It is stated that it is difficult to assess the financial loss due to this delay, but has it any time been attempted to find the probable loss to the department on account of delays say in the last one or two years and found difficult?

Shri Shahnawaz Khan: It is a very difficult thing to assess the delays in terms of money. Whenever any article of store is not available from abroad or not forthcoming, the railways try and improvise and keep the trains running anyhow.

Shri B. S. Murthy: May I know what attempts have been made to remove the difficulties mentioned by the Parliamentary Secretary, and what is the progress made from last year to this year?

The Minister of Railways and Transport (Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri): It is true that we have experienced great difficulty in getting our supplies in time and we have taken up this matter with the W. H. S. Minister a number of times before. A committee was set up by the W. H. S. Ministry. They have given us some additional powers. Now the Railways can purchase up to the limit of Rs. 10,000 of stores, but most of the goods have still to be indentedt hrough theDirector General, Supply. There has been shortage of steel and pig iron. That shortage could

not be met unless adequate quantities of steel or pig iron were imported from abroad. The Commerce and Industry Ministry are now pursuing this matter and pursuing it very effecively, and I hope that most of our difficulties would be solved in the coming year.

Cattle-Dung

*457. **Shri H. N. Mukerjee:** Will the Minister of **Food and Agriculture** be pleased to state:

(a) what is the latest estimate of cattle dung burnt as fuel in India;

(b) what is the coal equivalent of such dung; and

(c) what progress, if any, has been made in producing gas from cow-dung?

The Minister of Agricluture (Dr. P. S. Deshmukh). (a) It is estimated that 50% of the total production of dung on dry weight basis is being used as fuel in India.

(b) According to available information the heat value of 100C. feet of gas from cow-dung is estimated to be equivalent to 8 lbs. of charcoal.

(c) Experimental work on the production of combustible gas from cattle dung has been carried on at I. A. R. I. since 1939, and a pilot plant was later designed and set up in 1941. A model of cattle-dung plant, with a production capacity of 100 C. feet of gas per day, has since been evolved. This is sufficient for a family of 4 Members, and 6 units of this type have been set up in the villages of Delhi State, where intensive Cultivation schemes of the I. A. R. I. are in operation.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee : May I know if it is a fact that, as the Prime Minister stated some time ago, some 80 per cent of the country's energy consumption is represented by cattle-dung ?

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh : It must be an approximation. According to the figures which appear to be a little more accurate, it comes to 50 per cent.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee : May I know what progress has been made in regard to the introduction of the process of the conversion of cow-dung into gas through the Community Project administration and the National Extension Service ?

The Minister of Food and Agriculture (Shri A. P. Jain) : So far, this plant has not been finalised. It was found that during the winter it produces less of gas, and now they are devising to overcome that difficulty.

Shri Sarangadhar Das : May I know if there is any alternative fuel to take the place of cow-dung or gas—for instance, making briquettes out of coal dust and transporting to those places where there is no cow-dung ?

Shri A. P. Jain : The hon. Member has given a sensilble suggestion, and of course there is also wood.

Shri Ramachandra Reddi : With reference to part (a) of the question may I know how the estimates are prepared, and whether they are simply guesstimates ?

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh : That is based on the cattle census recently taken. There is an average dried weight of the dung produced by each cattle every day.

Shri Veeraswamy: May I know the quantity of cow-dung that is being consumed every year for the production of *vibudhi* for use in temples ?

Mr. Speaker : The hon. Member wants to know how much of cow-dung is used in temples. Is the Minister in a position to answer ?

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh : The total quantity of cow-dung which is estimated to be produced in the country comes to about 454 million tons annually.

सेठ अचल सिंह : क्या माननीय मंत्री बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि काऊडंग (गोबर) उपलों की शक्ल में इस्तेमाल न हो, इस के लिये सरकार क्या प्रयत्न कर रही है ?

डा० पं० शा० देशमुख : इस विषय में प्रचार करने की कोशिश की जाती है कि वह इस तरह इस्तेमाल न हो । हमारी योजना में भी यह जहां तक सम्भव हो, ज्यादा कोयला उपलब्ध करने का विचार है ।

Maternity Centres in PEPSU

*458. **Shri Ram Krishan :** Will the Minister of **Health** be pleased to refer to the reply given to Starred Question No. 1691 on the 24th April, 1956 and state whether the scheme submitted by PEPSU Government for opening 25 Maternity Centres has been finalised ?

The Deputy Minister of Health (Shrimati Chandrasekhar) : Maternity and child welfare work will hereafter be carried out through Health Centres as part of their work and the Planning Commission have accepted a provision of Rs. 7 (seven) lakhs in the PEPSU State Plan for the conversion of six Maternity and Child Welfare Centres into Rural health Centres.

श्री राम कृष्ण : क्या मैं जान सकता हूं कि ये सैन्टर कहां कहां खोले जायेंगे ?

Shrimati Chandrasekhar : That will be decided by the State Government.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty : May I know whether all the State Governments could send in their schemes for the opening of these maternity centres, and also whether these will be opened by the Central Government or the State Government concnered ?

Shrimati Chandrasekhar : The assistance for the opening of these maternity centres will be given by the Central Ministry, but the centres will be opened by the State Ministry.

Dr. Rama Rao : May I know what percentage of the expenditure is met by the Central Government, and what percentage by the State Government ?

The Minister of Health (Rajkumari Amrit Kaur) : There is a definite plan of assistance. I am speaking from memory, when I say it is 100 per cent in the first year for the fitst six months, then 66 per cent for the next year and then 33 per cent and so on.

Farmers' Forum

*459. **Shri Jhulan Sinha** : Will the Minister of **Food and Agriculture** be pleased to refer to the reply given to Question No. 1799 on the 27th April, 1956 and state whether all India Farmers' Forum have submitted any report about its activities to the Government ?

The Minister of Agriculture (Dr. P. S. Deshmukh) : The Farmers' Forum being a private Organsination registered under the Registration of Societies Act 1860, no reports of its activities are called for by the Government of India. But copies of two publications of the Forum have been obtained and kept in the Library of the Sabha.

Shri Jhulan Sinha : May I know whether this Forum receives any regular grants from the Government of India ?

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh : There is no regular grant as such. An *ad hoc* grant of Rs. 1,65,000 was sanctioned more than a year ago.

Shri Jhulan Sinha : May I know whehter while making these *ad hoc* grants, Government insist on having a report of its activities in the country ?

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh : I have already stated that no report was contemplated. But Government are aware, by and large, of the activities of this Forum.

Shri L. N. Mishra : May I know whether it is a fact that a very large majority of the delegates who attended this Forum during the last two years were either big agriculturists or *ex*-zamindars, and if so, whether Government propose to evolve some scheme whereby representation could be given on this Forum to the small cultivators also ?

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh : The hon. Members's impression is incorrect. There was a large number of smaller cultivators who were present at both the meetings.

श्री भक्त दर्शन : अभी मंत्री जी ने बताया है कि इस संस्था का सरकार से सीधा सम्बन्ध नहीं है, लेकिन क्या यह सत्य नहीं है कि राष्ट्रपति जी ने इस का उद्घाटन किया और प्रधान मंत्री और दूसरे बड़े-बड़े मंत्रियों ने इस में भाग लिया और भाषण दिये ।

खाद्य और कृषि मंत्री (श्री अ० प्र० जैन) : इस से कोई बड़ा सम्बन्ध कायम नहीं हो जाता है । बहुत सी सभायें होती हैं, जिन का उद्घाटन राष्ट्रपति करते हैं और दूसरे मंत्री भी उन में हिस्सा लेते और बोलते हैं ।

Shri Thimmaiah : May I know whether the representatives of agricultural labour were also invited for this forum ?

Shri A. P. Jain : This is a farmers' Forum.

Shri B. S. Murthy : May I know whether agricultural labour comes under the definition of 'farmer' ?

Shri A. P. Jain : They take part in cultivation, of course, but they do not come within the scope of the definition of 'farmer'.

Shri Thimmaiah : They are practical farmers.

Export of *Chira* from Manipur

*460. **Shri Rishang Keishing** : Will the Minister of **Food and Agriculture** be pleased to state :

(a) whether it is a fact that the Government of Manipur issued in 1956 a permit for export of about 500 maunds of *Chira* outside Manipur to a butcher, who came from Madras about a year back :

(b) whether it is a fact that the Government of Manipur has extended the per-

mit by a month as he could not collect and export the permitted quanitity of *chira* during the specified period of the original permit of seven days ;

(c) whether it is a fact that a large number of local traders were not permitted to export *chira* ; and

(d) if so, the necessary conditions which must be fulfilled in order to get permit from the Government for the export ?

The Minister of Agriculture (Dr. P. S. Deshmukh) : (a) to (d). Except for a short period from 1st March, 1956 export of *chira* was freely allowed from November 1955 to both local traders and outsiders without any distinction. That policy was based both on the availability of stocks and because *chira* provides employement to people in the State. No information about the profession, place of birth and length of residence in Manipur was sought for from the applicants and no such information is available in respect of the un-named persons referred to in the Question. Extension of permits was also freely given. No conditions were prescribed for the issue of export permits.

Shri B. D. Pandey: What is the meaning of '*chira*' ?

The Minister of Food and Agriculture (Shri A. P. Jain) : *Chira* is what the hon. Members calls *chola*.

Mr. Speaker : But what is *chola* ?

Shri A. P. Jain : It is beaten rice or flattened rice.

Shri Rishang Keishing : May I know the number of permits issued during 1955-56, and how many of these permits were given to the local traders ?

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh : As I have already stated, we have no information as to how many permits were given to local traders and how many to persons from outside, because the commodity was freely allowed to be exported. The total number of persons to whom licences were given was 583 during January-April 1956, for the export of 1,15,374 maunds of *chira* in all.

Shri Rishang Keishing : May I know the total quantitv of *chira* exported in 1955-56 ?

Mr. Speaker : The Minister has said that it was about a lakh and odd maunds.

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh : I have already given the figures which are available with me.

Shri Rishang Keishing : Is it no a fact that the butcher referred to in part (b) of my question was brought to Manipur especially to supply meat which would cater to the taste of the officers from outside the State, and if so, may I know why permit was given to this man and not to the local traders ?

Shri A. P. Jain : It will be clear from the question that the hon. Member has not given any details. The permit was given a year ago to a butcher from Madras. We have said that we had not prescribed any condition that the applicant should give information as to his permanent residence or caste. So, it is not possible to answer. Perhaps, the hon. Member knows more of details. If he could give us some more details, I am prepared to deal with the question.

Shri B. S. Murthy : Is he still a butcher ?

Shipping Companies

*462. **Shri Jaipal Singh** : Will the Minister of **Transport** be pleased to state :

(a) the charges made by shipping companies to visitors for Passes ;

(b) the annual receipts company- wise since 1950 ; and

(c) the names of the charities and hospitals receiving payments from such collections ?

The Deputy Minister of Railways and Transport (Shri Alagesan): (a). Some companies charge Rs. 3/- per visitor's pass while others charge Rs. 5/- per pass.

(b) and (c). The information is being collected and will be laid on the Table of the Lok Sabha in due course.

Shri Jaipal Singh : May I know whether the issue of passes on payment of something like Rs. 5 is with the consent of the Central Government ?

Shri Algesan : Of course, inasmuch as even the Eastern Shipping Corporation, in which Government hold majority shares. also charge these fees, I may say it is with the consent of Government, though it is implied and not very explicit.

Shri Jaipal Singh : I could not hear the Minister.

Mr. Speaker : Similar fees are charged with respect to other passes, thought it is not explicit in this case. It is with the permission or implied consent of the Central Government that the fee is charged.

Shri Alagesan : This arrangement in regard to passes has been devised more to fall in line with the wishes of the Collector of Customs who does not want many people, for obvious reasons.

Shri Jaipal Singh : If that is the case, why does the Collector of Customs not collect this money for the Government of India, and why should it go to charities and hospitals ?

Shri Alagesan : I do not think there is anything seriously wrong with the present arrangement. Perhaps, the Collector of Customs feels that it will be too difficult for him to manage. Moreover, these passes fare for visiting the various ships. Naturally, the shipping company that owns the ship collects these charges, and it makes its donations to hospitals and charities.

Shri Jaipal Singh : Is there a committee or a controlling body, which is responsible for the disbursement of the vast amounts that are collected by the shipping company, and if so, may I know the names of the personnel ?

Shri Alagesan : No, the respective shipping companies make donations.

Shri Jaipal Singh : There are two places where the Collector of Customs and the Port Health officers are asked to make their endorsement when these passes are issued. Why do they not endorse them ?

Shri Alagesan : That is more to control the entry of people into the harbour.

Mr. Speaker : It is a matter of detail.

Regional Employment Exchange, Hyderabad

*463. **Shri Krishnacharya Joshi** : Will the Minister of **Labour** be pleased to state :

(a) the nature of the future set up of the regional Employment Exchange in Hyderabad ; and

(b) whether Government propose to integrate the Directorate of the present Andhra with Hyderabad Employment Exchange ?

The Deputy Minister of Labour (Shri Abid Ali) :(a) and (b) No. proposal has been received so far from the State Government either for a change in the existing arrangement of the Hyderabad Regional Employemtnt Exchange or the integration of the Exchanges of Andhra with those of Hyderabad.

Shri Krishnacharya Joshi : May I know what will be the position of the Marathwada and Kannada areas of Hyderabad after the State is reorganised ?

Shri Abid Ali : These will be amalgamated with the respective States which will be formed.

Shri Krishnacharya Joshi : How many officers are working in the Hyderabad directorate at present ?

Shri Abid Ali : At present, there are only three Employment Exchanges, one each at Aurangabad, Safabad and Warrangal. I have not got with me the number of officers working there.

Shri Krishnacharya Joshi : How many officers are there in the Andhra State ?

Shri Abid Ali : The number of Employment Exchanges is 10. The number of officers is not available here.

Shri B. S. Murthy : Were there any officers who were retrenched when the State Governments took over these Exchanges ? If so, in the integration of Andhra and Telangana, as well as integration of other States, will these officers be given first preference in employment ?

Shri Abid Ali : According to the understanding which was arrived at at the last Labour Ministers' Conference in Hyderabad, there would not be any retrenchment from these Employment Exchanges, and all employees would be absorbed.

Tunnel under Brahmaputra

*466. **Sardar Iqbal Singh** : Will the Minister of **Transport** be pleased to state :

(a) whether there is any proposal to construct a tunnel under the river Brahmaputra ;

(b) if so, the details of the proposal ; and

(c) the total cost of the scheme and when this will be completed ?

The Deputy Minister of Railways and Transport (Shri Alagesan) : (a) to (c). The alternatives of constructing a road bridge over the Brahmaputra river, or a tunnel under the river bed, at Jogighopa or near Gauhati are under technical examination and preliminary investigations in this connection are in hand. It will be some time before the detailed and complete geological and seismographic data required for taking a final decision in the matter become available.

Sardar Iqbal Singh : May I know whether any foreign firm has been given a contract for the designing and planning of this tunnel ?

Shri Alagesan : We are very far away from that stage. Even the survey work has not yet begun. We had asked the Assam Government to prepare an estimate for carrying out a survey, and we are awaiting that estimate.

Barbil Iron and Manganese Mines

*468. **Shrimati Renu Chakravartty** : Will the Minister of **Labour** be pleased to state :

(a) Whehter it is a fact that certain provisions in the Mines Act are being contravened in the iron and manganese mines in Barbil area belonging to Messrs: Bird and Co.; and

(b) if so, the steps Government have taken.

The Deputy Minister of Labour (Shri Abid Ali) : (a) Certain contraventions of the provisions of the Mines Act and the Rules and Regulations thereunder were noticed in the mines belonging to the Company in Barbil area, when an Officer of the Mines Department inspected the mines in April, 1956.

(b) The Company has been asked by the Mines Department to comply with the provisions of the Mines Act and Rules and Regulations which have been contravened. The matter is being followed up by the Chief Inspector of Mines.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty : Is it a fact that annual leave with wages has not been given for the years 1952, 1953, 1954 and 1955 ? If so, since it is outstanding for such a long period, what pressure is brought by Government to bear upon the company to give it.

Shri Abid Ali : According to the information which I have, this point was not mentioned in the representation recieved from the Union.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty : When the employees of mines contravene the Mines Act, what is it that Government can do in order to force the mine-owners to quickly remedy the state of affairs ?

Shri Abid Ali : Necessary action has been taken under the Mines Act. They are first told to rectify the defects. If they persist in not doing so, they are prosecuted.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty : Since when have the Government taken up this matter, and within what time, the defects will be remedied ?

Shri Abid Ali : Most of the items which were mentioned by the Union with regard to the workers have been settled when our inspector visited the mines.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty : May I being to the notice of Government that negotiations for provision of creches and canteens at least in some of the mines have been going on for a long time, and as yet nothing has been done. How then has the Minister come to know that all the points have been settled ?

Shri Abid Ali : The Inspector of Mines has already asked all the mine-owners (not only about Barbil) to send him full information concernning this. He is doing the needful in the matter. Sometimes there is inability. Then we give facilities to the mine-owners. But when there is unwillingness, immediate action is taken.

Sugar

*469. **Dr. Rama Rao** : Will the Minister of **Food and Agriculture** be pleased to state :

(a) the sugar prices as on 1st July, 1956, 1st June, 1956 and 1st June, 1955 (or any near dates) at Madras and Bezwada :

(b) whether any shortage of sugar is anticipated by the end of march, 1957 for the country's needs; and

(c) the steps taken to step up further production ?

The Minister of Agriculture (Dr. P. S. Deshmukh) : (a) to (c). A statement giving the required information is laid on the Table of the Lok Sabha. [*See* Appendix III, annexure No. 31].

Dr. Rama Rao : In view of the exorbitant rise in the price of sugar at Vijayawada and Madras, for instance, do Government contemplate starting their own sugar factories instead of encouraging the establishment of some more factories in the private sector ?

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh : We are not starting our own sugar factories anywhere, but we are encouraging very substantially the establishment of co-operative factories all over the country.

Dr. Rama Rao : While Government are encouraging the establishment of sugar factories, sugar price is also going up. What action are Government taking in the matter ?

The Minister of Food and Agriculture (Shri A. P. Jain) : Sugar price is not going up. It went up in the south for some time. Then we sent supplies from the north, and it has come down.

Shri B. S. Murthy : How many more sugar factories are to be started in both Madras and Andhra States ? Does the Minister think that after the establishment of these sugar factories the prices will come down or come to normal ?

Shri A. P. Jain : I cannot give the figure for Madras and Andhra off hand, but if the hon. Member tables a separate question, I will supply it.

Dr. Rama Rao : Have the Government any information about the progress of these so-called co-operative sugar factories which have been licensed by Government so far?

Shri A. P. Jain : I object to the word 'so-called'. They are co-operative factories, and genuine co-operative factories. We are expecting that 8 or 10 of these factories will come into operation during the season 1956-57.

P. & T. Department, Travancore-Cochin

*471. **Shri Matthen** : Will the Minister of **Communications** be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Department has paid the arrears of pay to the *ex*-Anchal Staff, who are now employees of the Post and Telegraph Department, Travancore-Cochin.

(b) if so, the reasons why the *inter se* seniority of the *ex*-Ancha employees has not been settled yet, even though it is now more than six years since the integration has taken place; and

(c) whether Government will issue immediate orders to redress their legitimate grievances in view of the great hardship these poor employees are undergoing on account of the above said delay?

The Minister of Communications (Shri Jagjivan Ram) : (a) Arrears are due to about 2015 officials. The cases of 553 have been settled so far. The remaining are under consideration.

(b) The matter is extremely complicated due to there being several grades within a single cadre in the *ex*-state services and appointment in each grade not being regulated by successive promotions. The general rule in vogue in the P. & T. Department for fixing seniority on the basis of length of continuous service cannot be applied as it would result in persons recruited in higher grades direct and having less service being ranked junior to persons recruited in lower grade but who have more service to their credit. The matter was discussed in an inter Departmental meeting recently and final orders are expected to be issued shortly.

(c) The position has been explained in Part (b) of the question above.

Shri Matthen : Because of the fact that *inter se* seniority has not been fixed even after six years of integration, even for temporary vacancies, staff with service of 20 or 25 years are ignored and men very much junior to them with other service are put in their place. Is it not an injustice? Will the Minister consider settling the question of seniority soon so that men with the same qualifications can get the same job and promotion?

Shri Jagjivan Ram : I do admit that it is leading to such anomalies. In order to remove those anomalies we are taking steps. As I have said, the complication arises out of the very nature of the conditions of service in the *ex*-States. I hope the matter will be finalised soon. The Home Ministry has taken up the matter and they are the authority to fix the seniorities and as soon as *inter se* seniority is fixed, I think all these anomalies of which my hon. friend has complained will disappear.

Shri Matthen : It is true that it will be done as soon as the *inter se* seniority is fixed. But, when is that going to be?

Shri Jagjivan Ram : I hope it will take at the most two or three months.

Shri A. M. Thomas : May I enquire whether as many as 650 *ex*-State telephone employees taken over to the Centre with effect from 1-4-50 have not yet had their *inter se* seniority fixed and may I also enquire what exactly is the difficulty in this department, wheras in other departments like the Excise, Accounts and Income-tax, this has been finished?

Shri Jagjivan Ram : I have explained the difficulties in reply to part (b) of the question. If I may further explain, it is this. In the P. & T. Department, for the same type of work they have different grades of employees. I may illustrate this for the information of my friends from Travancore-Cochin. In the clerical grade itself, we had clerks in the grade of Rs. 80—5—100 and Anchal Masters in the two grades of Rs. 40—5—75 and Rs. 30—3—45. Solters again, for the same type of work, were in the grades of Rs. 30—4—50—5—75 and Rs. 25—1½—40. We have to integrate all the different grades. And appointment in the higher grades was done not only by promotion but partly by promotion and partly by direct recruitment. After integration, we find, as I have given already in my reply that it is leading to complications. If we go by length of service, persons in the higher grade are likely to be superseded by persons in the lower grade and we have to solve all these difficulties. We cannot apply the departmental rules and, therefore, certain rules have to be evolved in order to surmount all these difficulties which arise out of the complicated grades.

Shri A. M. Thomas : Is it a fact that the Director General of Posts and Telegraphs issued an order in October 1952 to give provisional promotions to the ex-

State staff also pending the issue of final orders about *inter se* seniority and whether that order has not yet been given effect to?

Shri Jagjivan Ram : We did. That proves our intention to solve the difficulties as soon as we can. But, when that order was to be implemented we found that these anomalies were going to arise and persons from the lower grades were going over the heads of those in the higher grades, according to those orders. So *adhoc* rules had to be followed and that is being done.

Shri Matthen : For the pre- 1938 P.&.T services the age of superannuation was 60 years. Even though, the other day, it was said that the *ex*-State services would have the same facilities, pre-1938 men are asked to retire in the 55th year These are very unfair. I only want that the old Anchal service men should be put on a par with the pre-1938 entrants of the Department.

Shri Jagjivan Ram : This may be examined. But option was given to all the *ex*-State employees either to opt for the Central conditions of services or to choose the State conditions. To those who have chosen the Central conditions of service, of course, all the conditions will apply. It may not be fair that a portion of the Central conditions should apply—those that are beneficial to them—and also that some portion of the State conditions should apply. That will not happen. Those who have opted for the Central conditions of service will have all the conditions applied.

सराय रोहिल्ला स्टेशन

*४७२. **श्री नवल प्रभाकर** : क्या रेलवे मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) क्या यह सच है कि सरकार छोटी पटरी पर चलने वाली समस्त रेलों को सराय रोहिल्ला स्टेशन से चलाने का विचार कर रही है ; और

(ख) यदि हां तो इस काम के लिये इस रेलवे स्टेशन का विस्तार कब तक किया जायेगा ।

रेलवे तथा परिवहन मंत्री के सभा-सचिव (श्री शाहनवाज खां) : (क) जी नहीं ।

(ख) सवाल नहीं उठता ।

श्री नवल प्रभाकर : क्या मैं जान सकता हूं कि दिल्ली के सराय रोहिल्ला स्टेशन से डीजल ट्रेनें चलाई जाती हैं ?

श्री शाहनवाज खां : जी हां, चलाई जाती हैं । एक तो हिसार के लिये और दूसरी लुहारू के लिये चलाई जाती है ।

श्री नवल प्रभाकर : माननीय मंत्री ने अभी जवाब दिया कि "सवाल नहीं उठता", तो जब वहां से आप डीजल ट्रेनें चला रहे हैं तो क्या और दूसरी ट्रेनें वहां से नहीं जा सकती हैं ?

श्री शाहनवाज खां : वहां से दो गाड़ियों के चलाने और सब गाड़ियों के चलाने में काफी फर्क है ।

श्री नवल प्रभाकर : क्या मैं जान सकता हूं कि दिल्ली मेन रेलवे स्टेशन पर भीड़भाड़ को देखते हुए जिस तरीक़े से नई दिल्ली रेलवे स्टेशन से इधर को जाने वाली गाड़ियां चलाई जाती हैं उसी तरीक़े से क्या इस बात पर भी विचार किया जायेगा कि दिल्ली के सराय रोहिल्ला स्टेशन से भी और गाड़ियां चलाई जायें ?

श्री शाहनवाज खां : फिलहाल ऐसा कोई इंतजाम करने का इरादा तो नहीं है, अलबत्ता दिल्ली मेन स्टेशन को अगर वहां कुछ कमी है तो उस को बढ़ा करने की कोशिश की जा रही है और उस के लिये करीबन १३ लाख रुपया मीटर गेज सैक्शन को बढ़ाने के लिये मंजूर कर दिया गया है ।

श्री राधा रमण : गवर्नमेंट की वह स्कीम कि जिस के जरिये दिल्ली के चारों तरफ रेल फैलाने का खयाल जाहिर किया गया था कहां तक पूरी हुई है और उस के पूरा होने में अभी कितनी देर और लगेगी ?

श्री शाहनवाज खां : अगर आप मेहरबानी कर के एक दूसरा सवाल करेंगे तो उस का जवाब दे दिया जायेगा ।

श्री नवल प्रभाकर : क्या मैं जान सकता हूं कि जब डीज़ल ट्रेनें सराय रोहिल्ला स्टेशन से चलाई जा रही हैं और चूंकि यहां से बहुत सी सवारियां उतरती और चढ़ती हैं तो इस बात को देखते हुए क्या इस स्टेशन के विकास की ओर ध्यान दिया जायेगा ?

श्री शाहनवाज खां : जब जब जरूरत महसूस होगी हर एक स्टेशन के विकास के लिये ध्यान दिया जायेगा ।

Illegal Telephone Exchanges

*473. **Shri N. B. Chowdhury** : Will the Minister of **Communications** be pleased to state:

(a) the number of cases of maintaining Illegal Telephone Exchanges that have been detected in Calcutta area during the year 1955-56; and

(b) the number of cases in which the offenders have been punished?

The Minister of Communications (Shri Jagjivan Ram) : (a) The case is still under police investigation and the details are not known.

(b) Does not arise.

Shri N. B. Chowdhury: May I know whether it is a fact that these illegal telephone exchanges were found to be used for illegal speculation in the Stock Exchange?

Shri Jagjivan Ram : That is what appeared in the Press.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty : May I know what is the reason for the long delay in investigation and finding out the details and proceeding with the matter?

Shri Jagjivan Ram : That should be put to the State Government.

Shri N. B. Chowdhury: How many cases are there and in how many have proceedings taken place?

Shri Jagjivan Ram: I have said that the police investigation is going on. We do not know anything about that.

पर्यटन

*४७४. श्री हेम राज : क्या परिवहन मंत्री २८ मई, १९५६ के तारांकित प्रश्न संख्या २७१९ के उत्तर के सम्बन्ध में यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) क्या द्वितीय पंचवर्षीय योजना में पर्यटन का विकास करने के लिये पंजाब सरकार द्वारा भेजी गई योजनायें स्वीकार कर ली गई हैं :

(ख) यदि हां, तो क्या उन की एक प्रति सभा-पटल पर रखी जायेगी ; और

(ग) उन पर अनुमानत: कितना धन व्यय किया जायेगा ?

रेलवे तथा परिवहन मंत्री के सभा-सचिव (श्री शाहनवाज खां) : (क) तथा (ख). पर्यटन के विकास के लिये जो योजनायें पंजाब के बारे में अन्तिम रूप से मंजूर की गई हैं उन को दूसरी पंच वर्षीय योजना-कार्यक्रम में शामिल कर दिया गया है । योजना-कार्यक्रम की प्रतियां एक व्याख्यात्मक टिप्पणी के साथ संसद् के पुस्तकालय से मिल सकती हैं ।

(ग) १६.९३ लाख रुपये ।

Shri Hem Raj : May I know whether any tourist bureaus are going to be opened in the Punjab for encouraging tourism and if so at what places?

Shri Shahnawaz Khan : We have branches of tourist bureaus in places where it is necessary.

Shri Hem Raj : May I know at what places these bureaus will be opened?

Shri Shahnawaz Khan : I shall require notice for that.

Shri Hem Raj : May I know whether these tourist bureaus will be financed by the States or by the Centre and the States and if so in what proportion?

The Deputy Minister of Railways and Transport (Shri Alagesan) : The Central Government is running various tourist offices in the larger cities and hill stations. If there are tourist bureaus set up by the State Governments or local bodies, the Centre will consider the question of extending financial assistance towards the running of such bureaus.

Railway Tools Factories

*475. **Mulla Abdullabhai** : Will the Minister of **Railways** be pleased to state:

(a) the number of Railway Tools Factories in India State-wise; and

(b) whether Government propose to establish a Railway Tools Factory at Nagpur?

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Railways and Transport (Shri Shahnawaz Khan) : (a) None.

(b) No.

Mulla Abdullabhai : Will the Government consider the proposal to establish a factory at Nagpur ?

Shri Shahnawaz Khan : At present the Railways do not have any such proposal.

Oudh-Tirhut Mail

*476. **Shri Barman** : Will the Minister of **Railways** be pleased to state:

(a) since when Air-conditioned coaches and number of berths in the same have been provided in the Oudh-Tirhut Mail, on the Siliguri-Lucknow route, and the traffic results thereof upto-date;

(b) the number of first class berths provided in the same train and traffic results thereof; and

(c) whether complaints have been received by the Railways as regards the inadequacy of first class berths in the same train?

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Railways and Transport (Shri Shahnawaz Khan) : (a) to (c). A statement is laid on the Tables of the Lok Sabha [*See* Appendix III, Annexure No. 32].

Shri Barman : It appears from the reply to part (a) that the average occupation for No. 301 Mail is about 20 per cent and for No. 302 Mail about 27 per cent. May I know whether any officials are entitled to travel by air-conditioned berths just paying the difference between the former first class fare and the air-conditioned accommodation fare, and whether other first class passengers have to pay the present first class fare plus the difference between the present first class fare and the fare for air-conditioned accommodation?

The Deputy Minister of Railways and Transport (Shri Alagesan) : As regards officers travelling by air-conditioned accommodation, rules have been made by the Home Ministry in this behalf. The officers themselves have to pay whatever difference there is over and above what they are reimbursed by their Ministries with the result that the Railway realises the full fare.

Shri Barman : As regards reply to part (b), may I know whether the percentage of 109·6 is related to the number of berths or to the number of seats in those berths, and in case it be the latter, may I know whether it has come to the knowledge of the Ministry that most of the first class passengers during sleeping hours have to move to some other compartments such as the third class compartments, causing inconvenience to themselves and others because the number of berths is insufficient ?

Shri Alagesan : In the case of air-conditioned accommodation, the number of berths is equated to the seats. In the case of first class the number of berths and of seats sometimes differ. If the accommodation is insufficient, we can certainly consider increasing it.

चीनी के सहकारी मिल

*४७७. **श्री खू० चं० सोधिया** : क्या खाद्य और कृषि मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) अभी तक प्रत्येक राज्य में सहकारिता के आधार पर चीनी के कितने मिल स्थापित किये गये हैं और इस वर्ष कितने मिल स्थापित करने का विचार है ; और

(ख) वे मिल किन राज्यों में स्थापित किये गये हैं या स्थापित किये जाने वाले हैं ?

कृषि मंत्री (डा० पं० शा० देशमुख) : (क) तथा (ख). पूछी गई हुई जानकारी का एक विवरण सभा के टेबल पर रख दिया गया है । [देखिये परिशिष्ट ३, अनुबन्ध सं० ३३].

श्री खू० चं० सोधिया : क्या मैं जान सकता हूं कि एक एवरेज (औसत दर्जे की) मिल को चलाने के लिये कितनी पूंजी की जरूरत पड़ती है ?

डा० पं० शा० देशमुख : एवरेज ८०० से १,००० टन की फैक्टरी के लिये ८० लाख तक खर्चा पड़ता है ।

श्री खू० चं० सोधिया : क्या मैं जान सकता हूं कि यह जो मिलें खुली हैं, इन

में से सब से ज्यादा पूंजी किस मिल में लगाई गई है ?

खाद्य और कृषि मंत्री (श्री अ० प्र० जैन) : पूंजी का बटवारा इस प्रकार होता है कि सहकारी समिति के जो मेम्बर होते हैं वे करीब करीब १० लाख या उस से ज्यादा रुपया इकट्ठा करते हैं और फाइनेंस कारपोरेशन (वित्त निगम) ३५ और ४० लाख के बीच रुपया देती है। इस के अलावा केन्द्रीय सरकार के पास पांच करोड़ रुपया है। उस में से वह राज्य सरकारों को कर्जा देने के लिये रुपया देती है जो १० लाख से २० लाख तक होता है। जो रुपया बाकी रह जाता है वह सहकारी समितियों तथा दूसरे लोगों से इकट्ठा किया जाता है।

Dr. Rama Rao: The statement says that five licences have been granted to co-operative societies in Andhra. Do Government see to what extent they actually are progressing with the work? In view of the difficult position of sugar, do Government consider that the necessary licences are granted and that they follow up their progress?

Shri A. P. Jain: A constant watch on the progress of the co-operative societies is kept by the licensing authority. It is for the licensing authority to see that proper progress is being made, and if proper progress is not made, under the rules the concerned licence can be cancelled.

श्री खू० चं० सोधिया : क्या यह बात सही नहीं है कि इन मिलों में से कइयों को ४०-४० लाख रुपया उधार दिलवाया गया है ?

श्री अ० प्र० जैन : ऐसा ही तो मैं ने बताया है कि ४०-४० लाख रुपये से भी ज्यादा।

Shri B. S. Murthy: May I know whether the Minister is in a position to tell the House as to the progress made by these five co-operative mills in Andhra and whether the whole money has been collected?

Shri A. P. Jain: I will require notice for that.

Shri Bishwa Nath Roy: In view of the increase in yield of sugarcane and its cultivation in U.P., may I know whether Government propose to take any steps for expediting the installation of the factories proposed to be established there ?

Shri A. P. Jain: Of course, this supplementary question is not covered by the main question; nonetheless I am prepared to answer it. It is a rather difficult question. It is not in the national interest that sugarcane should be crushed at any time except during the optimum period when the recovery is the maximum. I am not sure whether it will be possible for us to introduce a scheme whereby the factory may start crushing earlier. But I am examining that question.

Late running of Trains

*479. **Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy** Will the Minister of **Railways** be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the trains running between Mysore and Bangalore, and Mysore and Chamarajanagar are not running according to time schedule;

(b) whether it is also a fact that the main cause for this is failure of engines; and

(c) if so, whether Government propose to supply new engines to this line?

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Railways and Transport (Shri Shahnawaz Khan) :

(a) The overall punctuality performance of passenger carrying trains on the sections concerned has been satisfactory. There have, however, been occasional cases of late running of certain trains.

(b) There were only five engine failures during the months of May and June.

(c) Does not arise.

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: May I know how many times the trains in this section have run late during the last one year ?

Shri Shahnawaz Khan: That will require a lot of calculation and I shall, therefore, require notice. But I have given the hon. Member the figures of punctuality, and I might inform him that on the Bangalore-Mysore section, the figures of punctuality during the months of May, June and July have been 87, 89 and 90 per cent respectively, which are very high figures.

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: May I know whether the late running in this section is due to the old engines that have been still kept there and no new engines being supplied so far?

Shri Shahnawaz Khan: As the hon. Member is aware, we are trying to do our very best and orders for new locomotives

have been placed. It is expected that 189 engines will be received during the next Plan period, and out of that, 24 locomotives are to be allotted to this particular region.

Water Supply Schemes in Assam

*480. **Shri Debendra Nath Sarma:** Will the Minister of **Health** be pleased to state the total amount proposed to be granted to Assam in the Second Five year Plan for rural water supply and urban water-supply schemes?

The Deputy Minister of Health (Shrimati Chandrasekhar): Allocation of funds to various States for their Water Supply Schemes will be made from year to year and not as a block grant for the entire Second Five Year Plan period. For the year 1956-57, the Government of Assam will be allotted a sum of Rs. 4 lakhs as grant-in-aid for rural and Rs. 5 lakhs as loan for urban Schemes.

Shri Debendra Nath Sarma: The hon. Minister has said that the grant for the water supply schemes will be made from year to year and that Rs 4,00,000 has been allotted for Assam out of a total allotment of Rs. 53 crores in the Second Five Year Plan period. As such, is not Assam entitled to get at least a minimum sum of Rs. 20,00,000 annually? May I know the reason for this decrease? Why is this anomaly there?

Shrimati Chandrasekhar : I could only hear the word " anomaly " out of that question ; I did not hear anything else.

Shri Debendra Nath Sarma : May I repeat my question ?

Mr. Speaker : Now the question hour is over.

WRITTEN ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण निधि

*४४८. **श्री नारायण दास :** क्या खाद्य और कृषि मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) क्या भारत सरकार ने अखिल भारतीय ग्रामीण ऋण सर्वेक्षण की रिपोर्ट में की गई सिफारिश के अनुसार राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (सहायता और प्रत्याभूति) निधि की स्थापना की है ;

(ख) यदि नहीं, तो इस निधि की स्थापना का प्रश्न इस समय किस अवस्था में है ;

(ग) क्या भारत सरकार ने विभिन्न राज्यों में इसी प्रकार की निधियों की स्थापना के बारे में राज्य सरकारों से परामर्श किया है ; और

(घ) यदि हां, तो उस का क्या परिणाम निकला है ?

खाद्य और कृषि मंत्री (श्री अ० प्र० जैन) : (क) जी नहीं ।

(ख) यह फैसला किया गया है कि राष्ट्रीय स्तर पर ऐसी निधि की अलग स्थापना करने की जरूरत नहीं है । लेकिन जरूरत होने पर राज्य सरकारों को अपने साधनों की पूर्ति के लिये केन्द्रीय सरकार के वर्तमान साधनों से सहायता उपलब्ध होगी ।

(ग) जी हां ।

(घ) राज्य सरकारों ने "राज्य कृषि ऋण (सहायता और प्रत्याभूति) निधि" की स्थापना करना मान लिया है और अपनी दूसरी पंचवर्षीय योजनाओं में सहकारी विकास के लिये आवश्यक वित्त सहायता की व्यवस्था की है ।

Wheat from U. S. A.

*449. **Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad :**
Pandit D. N. Tiwary :

Will the Minister of **Food and Agriculture** be pleased to state :

(a) whether the Government of India are negotiating with United States Government for obtaining surpuls U. S. wheat supplies ; and

(b) if so, at what stage is the matter ?

The Minister of Food and Agriculture (Shri A. P. Jain) : (a) and (b) : Yes, Sir, talks have been going on between the representatives of the two Governments but no final decision has yet been reached.

Telco Locomotives

*450. **Shri T. B. Vittal Rao :** Will the Minister of **Railways** be pleased to refer to the reply given to Starred Question No. 153 on the 22nd February, 1956 and state :

(a) whether the Tariff Commission have since submitted their report regarding the prices to be paid for the locomotives manufactured by Telco ;

(b) if so, the decision arrived at ; and

(c) whether a copy of the report will be laid on the Table of the Sabha ?

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Railways and Transport (Shri Shahnawaz Khan) : (a) No, Sir.

(b) Does not arise.

(c) Yes, in due course.

Over-crowding in Trains

*455. **Shri Bibhuti Mishra** : Will the Minister of **Railways** be pleased to state :

(a) whether Government have formulated any schemes to remove overcrowding in trains, specially on the Western and the Eastern Railways within next five years ; and

(b) if so, main features of the scheme ?

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Railways and Transport (Shri Shahnawaz Khan) : (a) Certain tentative proposals have been formulated for providing additional passenger train accommodation on Railways during the 2nd Five Year Plan period.

(b) the main features of these proposals are :—

(*i*) Increase in line capacity on some sections to enable additional trains being run ;

(*ii*) provision of new passenger stock and locomotives both for replacement and to cater to additional traffic ; and

(*iii*) maximum utilisation of old and over-aged stock.

Ship Building

*461. **Shri D. C. Sharma** :
Sardar Akarpuri :

Will the Minister of **Transport** be pleased to refer to the reply given to Starred Question No. 693 on the 14th March, 1956, and state :

(a) whether any agreement has since been arrived at between the Government of India and the Government of Yugoslavia with regard to the building of ships ; and

(b) if so, the nature of the agreement ?

The Deputy Minister of Railways and Transport (Shri Alagesan) : (a) and (b) . Discussions were recently held between the representatives of the Western Shipping Corporation (Private) Ltd., a State owned and State operated shipping Company, and a delegation of shipping experts from Yugoslavia regarding building of ships for India in Yugoslavian Yards. As a result of the above discussions, the Corporation has decided to place, through the State Trading Corporaton (India) Ltd., an order with the " Uljanik" Shipyard, Pula, Yogoslavia, for the constructon of a Motor Cargo Vessel of 10,510 metric tons D. W. C. The formal contract for the purchase of the above ship is expected to be signed by the end of August, 1956.

कांस्टेलेशन वायुयान

*४६४. **श्री रघुनाथ सिंह** : क्या संचार मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) क्या एयर इंडिया इंटरनेशनल द्वारा अमेरिका से खरीदे गये सुपर जी० कांस्टेलेशन वायुयान प्रयोग में लाये जा रहे हैं ; और

(ख) यदि हां, तो वे कैसा काम दे रहे हैं ?

संचार मंत्री (श्री जगजीवन राम) : (क) जिन तीन सुपर कांस्टेलेशन १०४९ जी० विमानों के लिये क्रय आदेश दिया था उन में से अभी एक ही प्राप्त हुआ है । वह आजकल दीर्घा संभार (Galley equipment) के प्रतिष्ठापन के लिये भूमि पर है ।

(ख) यह विमान जब से आया है तब से भाटक, प्रशिक्षण और अभ्यास के लिये की गई उड़ानों पर १०६ घंटे उड़ा है । इन १०६ घंटों की उड़ानों में यह संतोषप्रद पाया गया है ।

Assam Rail-link

*465. **Shri Amjad Ali** : Will the Minister of **Railways** be pleased to state :

(a) whether he has made an on-the spot inspection of the conditions during the floods and monsoons from the 23rd June, 1956 onwards of the Assam rail-link ; and

(b) how he proposes to cope with the annual visitatons like inundations and consequent dislocation of traffic in the rail-link ?

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Railways and Transport (Shri Shahnawaz Khan) : (a) Yes Sir.

(b) A Committee has been set up to examine the general question of stabilisation of the link route and suggest remedial measures.

फिलीपीन्स को चावल का संभरण

*४६७. डा० राम सुभग सिंह : क्या खाद्य और कृषि मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) क्या यह सच है कि फिलीपीन्स सरकार ने भारत सरकार से चावल मांगा है ;

(ख) यदि हां तो फिलीपीन्स सरकार ने कुल कितना चावल मांगा है ; और

(ग) क्या भारत सरकार ने इस प्रार्थना को स्वीकार कर लिया है ?

खाद्य और कृषि मंत्री (श्री अ० प्र० जैन) : (क) जी हां ।

(ख) एक लाख मीट्रिक टन ।

(ग) जी नहीं ।

Railway Stores from U.S.S.R.

*470. **Shri Wodeyar** : Will the Minister of **Railways** be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that Government have placed orders for railways equipment with manufacturers in U.S.S.R;

(b) whether orders for rolling stock have also been placed with manufacturers in East Germany, Yugoslavia, Austria and Poland; and

(c) if so, the total value of the orders and the names of the firms in these countries ?

The Deputy Minister of Railways and Transport (Shri Alagesan) : (a) Yes.

(b) Yes.

(c) A statement is laid on the Table of the Lok Sabha [*See* Appendix III, annexure No. 34].

Monsoon Damage to Railways

*478. **Dr. J. N. Parekh** : Will the Minister of **Railways** be pleased to state :

(a) the extent of damage to Railways in Saurashtra during current monsoon ;

(b) for how many days and on what lines the traffic as disorganised ; and

(c) the steps taken to prevent recurrence ?

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Railways and Transport (Shri Shahnawaz Khan): (a) to (c). The information is being collected and will be laid on the Table of the Lok Sabha in due course.

मुजफ्फरपुर-दरभंगा रेलवे मार्ग

*४८१. श्री श्री नारायण दास : क्या रेलवे मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) पूर्वोत्तर रेलवे में मुजफ्फरपुर और दरभंगा के बीच रेलवे मार्ग के सर्वेक्षण में क्या प्रगति हुई है ; और

(ख) इस सर्वेक्षण में किन मुख्य बातों पर ध्यान आकर्षित किया गया है ?

रेलवे तथा परिवहन मंत्री के सभा-सचिव (श्री शाहनवाज़ खां) : (क) तथा (ख). सभा-पटल पर एक बयान रख दिया गया है जिस में मौजूदा हालत बतला दी गई है । [देखिये परिशिष्ट ३, अनुबन्ध सं० ३५].

Tractors

*482. **Shri T. B. Vittal Rao** : Will the Minister of **Food and Agriculture** be pleased to state :

(a) the total number of tractors purchased with the 10 million dollar loan received from the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development ;

(b) the number of these tractors declared unserviceable ; and

(c) the reasons therefor ?

The Minister of Food and Agriculture (Shri A. P. Jain) (a) 317.

(b) and (c). Fifteen tractors have been declared unserviceable because they have completed their useful life and are no longer economical to repair.

Oilseeds Crushing Industry Enquiry Committee

*483. **Shri Dabhi** : Will the Minister of **Food and Agriculture** be pleased to refer to the reply given to Starred Question No. 281 on the 27th February, 1956 and state :

(a) whether the Oilseeds Crushing Industry Enquiry Committee have submitted their report to Government;

(b) if so, their main recommendations : and

(c) which of them have been accepted by Government ?

The Minister of Food and Agriculture (Shri A. P. Jain) : (a) Yes.

(b) A note containing the main recommendations is placed on the Table of the Lok Sabha [*See* Appendix III, annexure No. 36].

(c) Since the Report has been submitted only on the 10th July, 1956, the recommendations are still to be examined.

कृषि सम्बन्धी गवेषणा और शिक्षा

४८४. **श्री भक्त दर्शन** : क्या खाद्य और कृषि मंत्री १६ अप्रैल, १९५६ के तारांकित प्रश्न संख्या १४५६ के उत्तर के सम्बन्ध में यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) कृषि सम्बन्धी गवेषणा और शिक्षा संस्था के बारे में संयुक्त दल द्वारा दी गई रिपोर्ट के बारे में क्या अब तक कोई निश्चय कर लिया गया है ;

(ख) यदि हां, तो क्या मुख्य मुख्य सिफारिशों के बारे में किये गये निश्चय की एक प्रति सभा-पटल पर रखी जायेगी ;

(ग) यदि नहीं, तो अन्तिम निश्चय कब तक किये जाने की आशा है ; और

(घ) इस सम्बन्ध में अभी तक कितनी प्रगति हुई है ?

खाद्य और कृषि मंत्री (श्री अ० प्र० जैन) : (क) जी हां ।

(ख) सभा की टेबल पर एक विवरण रख दिया गया है । [देखिये परिशिष्ट ३, अनुबन्ध सं० ३७] ।

(ग) तथा (घ). प्रश्न ही उत्पन्न नहीं होते ।

Delhi Junction

*485. **Shri Ram Krishan:** Will the Minister of **Railways** be pleased to state:

(a) whether the scheme for remodelling of Delhi Junction Station has been finalised; and

(b) if so, the main features of the Scheme?

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Railways and Transport (Shri Shahnawaz Khan): (a) No, Sir, it is still under investigation.

(b) The main features of the scheme are tentatively :—

1. Construction of a new island platform.
2. Extension of the existing platforms.
3. Provision of more and longer washing lines.
4. Provision of more coaching stabling capacity.
5. Provision of facilities for simultaneous reception and departure of trains from either end of the yard.

Locust Invasion

*486. **Sardar Iqbal Singh:**
Sardar Akarpuri:
Shri R. P. Garg:

Will the Minister of **Food and Agriculture** be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is fact that warning was given to India and Pakistan by Anti-locust Research Centre in London regarding the locust invasion of these two countries; and

(b) if so, the steps taken by the Government of India?

The Minister of Food and Agriculture (Shri A. P. Jain): (a) No specific warning was issued by the Anti-Locust Research Centre, London regarding the danger of locust invasion of India but a forecast was issued in one of the bulletins issued by the Anti-Locust Research Centre.

(b) The Government of India keep a careful watch on locust activity and undertake control measures wherever necessary.

Prices of Coconuts

*487. **Shri A. K. Gopalan:** Will the Minister of **Food and Agriculture** be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that due to the import of copra from Ceylon, prices of coconuts in coconut-producing areas are affected adversely; and

(b) if so, to what extent?

The Minister of Food and Agriculture (Shri A. P. Jain): (a) No, Sir.

(b) Does not arise.

Iron and Manganese Ore Mines

*488. **Shrimati Renu Chakravartty:** Will the Minister of **Labour** be pleased to state:

(a) whether there has been any enquiry into the conditions of iron and manganese ore mine workers prevailing in the Jamdah, Gua areas of Bihar and Barabil areas of Orissa; and

(b) whether any wage board is proposed to be set-up?

The Deputy Minister of Labour (Shri Abid Ali): (a) The labour Investigation Committee submitted in May-June, 1945, reports on labour conditions in the iron ore industry and in the manganese mining industry in India. The report concerning the former industry contains information in respect of Gua areas of Bihar but not in respect of Jamdah area of Bihar and Barabil areas of Orissa. In the case of manganese industry the report does not contain any specific information regarding the three areas mentioned above. Steps are being taken to bring the two reports up-to-date.

(b) The general question of setting up Wage Boards for certain industries is still under consideration.

Food Situation in Naga Hills

*489. **Shri Rishang Keishing:** Will the Minister of **Food and Agriculture** be pleased to state:

(a) the total requirement of food grains for the Naga Hills;

(b) the number of the villages where supply of food grains free or at subsidised rates has been started;

(c) the number of villages where food scarcity prevails or which have been left out on account of the presence and activities of the hostile Nagas; and

(d) the measures Government propose to cope with the food situation in the Naga Hills in view of the fact that people there have not done cultivation on account of the present tension and trouble?

The Minister of Food and Agriculture (Shri A. P. Jain): (a) There is not likely to be any serious shortage of foodgrains during the current crop year, but scarcity may develop during the next year as cultivation has been seriously interfered with owing to hostilities.

(b) So far 5 villages in Kohima subdivision and a number of camps at Kohima have been supplied with foodgrains either free of cost or at subsidised rates.

(c) The five villages referred to in reply to part (b) of the question have so far reported temporary shortage of foodgrains as movement of foodgrains to these villages has been prevented by the hostiles.

(d) The Government will meet full requirements of the Naga Hills if scarcity develops next year owing to non-cultivation of lands.

Hotel Training Schools

*490. **Shri Radha Raman:** Will the Minister of **Transport** be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government propose to open Hotel Training Schools; and

(b) if so, when this scheme is going to be implemented?

The Deputy Minister of Railways and Transport (Shri Alagesan): (a) and (b). The opening of one School is under consideration and it is too early yet to say when it is likely to start functioning.

Madras-Delhi Janta

*491. **Dr. Rama Rao:**
Dr. Satyawadi:
Shri Thimmaiah:

Will the Minister of **Railways** be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is fact that the "through-bogie" from Bangalore to Delhi has been stopped on the G. T. Express;

(b) whether it is also a fact that Government have received any representations that a "Hal" type coach Bangalore-Delhi be attached to the Daily Madras-Delhi Janta and *vice versa*; and

(c) if so, the action Government have taken in this regard?

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Railways and Transport (Shri Shahnawaz Khan): (a) Yes, Sir, from 1.7.1956.

(b) A suggestion to this effect has appeared in the Press.

(c) The suggestion is under consideration.

Amritsar Workshop

*492. **Shri D. C. Sharma:** Will the Minister of **Railways** be pleased to state:

(a) whether any plan has been formulated to expand the Amritsar Railway Workshop; and

(b) if so, the nature of the plan?

The Deputy Minister of Railways and Transport (Shri Alagesan): (a) Yes.

(b) The Workshop will be equipped to carry out periodical overhaul to about 260 Broad Gauge Locomotives per year based on the Northern Railway and to manufacture certain duplicate parts for the maintenance of Locomotives on that Railway.

Civil Aviation Training Centre

*493. **Shri H. N. Mukerjee:** Will the Minister of **Communications** be pleased to state:

(a) whether his attention has been drawn to the fact that facilities for Dakota conversion training at the Civil Aviation training centre, Allahabad, are very inadequate;

(b) whether quicker training for a greater number of candidates at Allahabad can be provided;

(c) whether he is aware that a number of trained pilots who have received their "B" licenses are forced to remain idle for years on account of paucity of Dakota training facilities at Allahabad; and

(d) whether Government will permit "B" licencees to have their Dakota conversion training from non-schedule companies and/or the Indian Airlines Corporation, elsewhere than at Allahabad?

The Minister of Communications (Shri Jagjivan Ram): (a) and (c). Facilities for Dakota conversion training at the Civil Aviation Training Centre, Allahabad are quite adequate to meet existing demands. The programme of training is so arranged that while the requirements of the Air Transport Industry are met fully, it is also ensured that the pilots so trained do not remain unemployed.

(b) There is at present no need for doing so.

(d) No, Sir. Such a course is neither desirable nor necessary, as the demands of the Air Transport Industry are already being fully met, by the training courses at the Civil Aviation Training Centre, Allahabad.

Central Board of Forestry

*494. **Shri Hem Raj:** Will the Minister of **Food and Agriculture** be pleased to state:

(a) the main subjects considered recently by the Standing Committee of the Central Board of Forestry and the decision taken thereon by it; and

(b) which of the recommendations made by it have been accepted by Government?

The Minister of Food and Agriculture (Shri A. P. Jain): (a) A statement is laid on the Table of the Lok Sabha. [*See* Appendix III, annexure No. 38].

(b) All the recommendations have been accepted by Government.

Railway Line to Garo Hills

*495. **Shri Debendra Nath Sarma:** Will the Minister of **Railways** be pleased to state:

(a) whether final decision has been taken on the question of construction of a Railway Line from Pandu to Garo Hills in the North Eastern Railway; and

(b) if so, when the actual construction work would start?

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Railways and Transport (Shri Shahnawaz Khan): (a) Not yet. A Preliminary Engineering Survey of the Darangiri-Amjanga route and a revision of the earlier survey of the Pandu-Amjanga link have been approved.

(b) Does not arise.

Tourism

*496. **Shri Shree Narayan Das:** Will the Minister of **Transport** be pleased to refer to the reply given to Starred Question No. 456 on the 3rd March, 1955 and state:

(a) the decision that has since been taken in the matter of internal tourism; and

(b) the facilities that have been provided to pilgrims, youths and workers on holidays?

The Deputy Minister of Railways and Transport (Shri Alagesan): (a) The provisions made for the development of internal tourism under the Second Five Year Plan are contained in Parts II & III of the Plan on tourism, a copy of which is already available in the Parliament Library.

(b) A statement is laid on the Table of the Lok Sabha [*See* Appendix III, Annexure No. 39].

Catering Contractors

*497. **Shri Dabhi:** Will the Minister of **Railways** be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the Estimates Committee have in their twenty-fifth report, recommended that the holdings of catering contractors should be reduced from 6 to 2 and that they should be progressively reduced to 2 in about 5 years time, so that a contractor can give his personal attention to all his establishments; and

(b) if so, whether Government propose to accept this recommendation?

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Railways and Transport (Shri Shahnawaz Khan): (a) The Estimates Committee's Recommendation under reference is that the upper limit of 12 for the holding of Catering Contracts should be reduced to 6, which should be progressively further reduced to 2 in about 5 years' time.

(b) Government have accepted the principle to gradually reduce the holdings of Catering Contractors.

The absolute limits of 6 and 2, suggested by the Estimates Committee, have not however, been accepted.

डाक और तार विभाग के कर्मचारी

*४९८. **श्री भक्त दर्शन** : क्या संचार मंत्री २७ अप्रैल, १९५६ के अतारांकित प्रश्न संख्या १५४७ के उत्तर के सम्बन्ध में ये बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) क्या उन मूल सिद्धान्तों के संबंध में इस बीच कोई अन्तिम निश्चय कर लिया गया है, जो डाक और तार विभाग के उन कर्मचारियों को दुबारा नौकरी देने के बारे में अपनाये जायेंगे, जो राजनैतिक कारणों से अलग कर दिये गये थे ;

(ख) यदि हां, तो क्या उक्त निश्चय की एक प्रति सभा-पटल पर रखी जायेगी ;

(ग) यदि नहीं, तो अन्तिम निश्चय कब तक किये जाने की आशा है ; और

(घ) अभी तक निश्चय न हो सकने के क्या कारण हैं ?

संचार मंत्री (श्री जगजीवन राम) : (क) जी नहीं ।

(ख) निर्णय हो जाने पर यह सभा-पटल पर रखा जायगा ।

(ग) कोई निश्चित तारीख नहीं दी जा सकती ।

(घ) इस बात की गृह-मंत्रालय द्वारा जांच की जा रही है । राजनैतिक दुःख-भोगियों की फिर से नौकरी पर ले लेने के बारे में कुछ प्रश्नों पर अभी तक उक्त मंत्रालय म विचार हो रहा है ।

Divisional System on Railways

*499. **Sardar Iqbal Singh:**
Sardar Akarpuri:

Will the Minister of **Railways** be pleased to refer to the reply given to Starred Question No. 268 on the 27th February, 1956 and state:

(a) further steps taken to enforce divisional system of working on the Indian Railways ;

(b) the date by which it is likely to be completed ; and

(c) the number of divisions that would be established as a result of divisional system of working on each Railway ?

The Deputy Minister of Railways and Transport (Shri Alagesan): A statement is placed on the Table of the Lok Sabha. [*See* Appendix III, annexure No. 40].

Employment Exchanges in West Bengal

*500. **Shrimati Renu Chakravartty:** Will the Minister of **Labour** be pleased to state:

(a) the number of additional Employment Exchanges to be opened this year in West Bengal; and

(b) the areas in which these will be opened ?

The Deputy Minister of Labour (Shri Abid Ali): (a) and (b). The number of additional Employment Exchanges to be opened and their location are under consideration.

Wagon Factory at Bharatpur

262. **Shri Ram Krishan:** Will the Minister of **Railways** be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that there is a proposal for setting up of a wagon building factory at Bharatpur in Rajasthan; and

(b) if so, the details thereof ?

The Deputy Minister of Railways and Transport (Shri Alagesan): (a) No.

(b) Does not arise.

Regional Employment Advisory Committee

263. **Shri Ram Krishan:** Will the Minister of **Labour** be pleased to state :

(a) whether the Regional Employment Advisory Committee has been constituted in the Punjab;

(b) if so, the names of the members of the Advisory Committee; and

(c) the date on which this Committee was constituted ?

The Deputy Minister of Labour (Shri Abid Ali): (a) The term of the previous committee has expired. It has not yet been reconstituted.

(b) and (c). Do not arise.

Irrigation

264. Shri Ram Krishan: Will the Minister of **Food and Agriculture** be pleased to state the total area State-wise to be irrigated during the Second Five Year Plan ?

The Minister of Food and Agriculture (Shri A. P. Jain): The requisite information in respect of Major, Medium and Tubewells irrigation schemes is available in the Second Five Year Plan Report (Chapter XVII, Pages 364-365 and page 330 respectively).

The information in respect of Grow More Food and Community Projects Administration Irrigation Schemes is being collected and will be placed on the Table of the Sabha in due course.

रेलवे लाइन की क्षमता

२६५. **श्री रघुनाथ सिंह** : क्या रेलवे मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि उत्तर बिहार में रेलवे लाइनों की क्षमता बढ़ाने के लिये जून, १९५६ तक क्या क्या कार्यवाही की गई है ?

रेलवे तथा परिवहन उपमंत्री (श्री अलगेशन) : उत्तर बिहार में रेलवे लाइनों की क्षमता बढ़ाने के लिये जो काम पूरे हो चुके हैं या हो रहे हैं उन का ब्योरा साथ की सूची में दिया गया है । [देखिये परिशिष्ट ३, अनुबन्ध सं० ४१].

शान्ता कुज हवाई अड्डे पर घटना

२६६. **श्री रघुनाथ सिंह** : क्या संचार मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) क्या यह सच है कि १२ जून, १९५६ को जब भारतीय इंडिया एयरलाइन्स कारपोरेशन का एक डाकोटा शान्ताक्रुज हवाई अड्डे पर उतर रहा था, तो एक गिद्ध ने उस पर आक्रमण किया, जिस से खिड़की टूट गई और चालक घायल हो गया ; और

(ख) यदि हां, तो भविष्य में इस प्रकार की घटना को रोकने के लिये क्या प्रबन्ध किया जा रहा है ?

संचार मंत्री (श्री जगजीवन राम) : (क) १२ जून, १९५६ को शान्ताक्रुज विमानपत्तन पर एक विमान उतरते समय गिद्ध से टकरा गया । इस कारण, विमान के पत्तन-वायुरक्षक शीशे को क्षति पहुंची किन्तु कोई व्यक्ति घायल नहीं हुआ ।

(ख) शान्ताक्रुज विमानपत्तन के निकट ही बांदरा का क़साईखाना है जो गिद्धों को आकर्षित करता है और वे विमानपत्तन के आसपास उड़ते रहते हैं । बम्बई सरकार से प्रार्थना की गई थी कि बम्बई नगरपालिका निगम से प्रबन्ध कर के क़साईखाने को अपने वर्तमान स्थान से हटवा दें और वहां से काफी दूर पर एक दूसरा आधुनिक ढंग का निर्माण करा दें । निगम क़साईखाने को हटाने के लिये सहमत तो हो गया है किन्तु अभी तक प्रस्ताव को कार्यान्वित नहीं किया है । बम्बई सरकार से इस पर बातचीत चल रही है । इस बीच में उन से वर्तमान क़साईखाने में कुछ सुधार करने की और उस के आसपास सफ़ाई तथा आरोग्यप्रद वातावरण रखने की प्रार्थना की गई है जिस से वहां गिद्ध आकर्षित न हो सकें ।

इंजन का पटरी से उतर जाना

२६७. **श्री रघुनाथ सिंह** : क्या रेलवे मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) क्या यह सच है कि बुधवार, २० जून को १ बजे रात में दक्षिण रेलवे के सत्तिराकुडी स्टेशन के पास एक माल गाड़ी का इंजन पटरी से उतर गया जिस के फलस्वरूप गाड़ियों का आना जाना रुक गया ; और

(ख) यदि हां, तो उस दुर्घटना का क्या कारण था ?

रेलवे तथा परिवहन उपमंत्री (श्री अलगेशन) : (क) जी नहीं ।

(ख) सवाल नहीं उठता ।

Air Accidents

268. Shri Ram Krishan: Will the Minister of **Communications** be pleased to state:

(a) the number of air accidents on Indian Airlines linewise, during the period from the 1st January, 1956 till the end of June, 1956;

(b) the total loss of life and property, accident-wise;

(c) the reasons for each accident; and

(d) the total amount paid as compensation ?

The Minister of Communications (Shri Jagjivan Ram): (a) to (c). Six accidents occurred to Indian Airlines aircraft during the period 1st January, 1956 to 30th June, 1956. The system of lines is no longer in existence in the Indian Airlines Corporation. The detail of these accidents is laid on the Table of the Lok Sabha. [*See* Appendix III, annexure No. 42].

(d) Nil.

Wheat Reserves

269. Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad : Will the Minister of **Food and Agriculture** be pleased to refer to the reply given to Unstarred Question No. 1803 on the 7th May, 1956 and state the names of those places where wheat reserves are proposed to be built?

The Minister of Food and Agriculture (Shri A. P. Jain) : A statement showing centres where wheat stocks are being located is laid on the Table of the Lok Sabha. [*See* Appendix III, annexure No. 43].

Bhopal-Bina Line

270. Shri T. B. Vittal Rao : Will the Minister of **Railways** be pleased to state:

(a) whether a firm decision regarding doubling the line from Bhopal to Bina has since been arrived at; and

(b) if so, the nature of the decision taken?

The Deputy Minister of Railways and Transport (Shri Alagesan) : (a) No, Sir.

(b) Does not arise.

Food Godown in Madras

271. Shri N. B. Chowdhary : Will the Minister of **Food and Agriculture** be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that godown keepers and other employees serving in the Regional Directorate of Food Madras, had not received their salaries for more than six months in June 1956; and

(b) if so, the reasons therefor?

The Minister of Food and Agriculture (Shri A. P. Jain) : (a) No, Sir.

(b) Does not arise.

Hassan-Mangalore Railway Project

272. Shri Madiah Gowda : Will the Minister of **Railways** be pleased to state :

(a) at what stage the proposed railway project between Hassan and Mangalore is at present; and

(b) when is it likely that all the preliminaries before the work of the project is taken up are going to be completed?

The Deputy Minister of Railways and Transport (Shri Alagesan) : (a) and (b). The field work for the Engineering and Traffic surveys has been completed and the project reports along with the detailed estimates are expected to be ready by August '56. A final decision will be taken after the survey reports are received and examined by the Board.

Directorate of Posts and Telegraphs Hyderabad

273. Shri Krishnacharya Joshi : Will the Minister of **Communications** be pleased to state :

(a) whether Government propose to maintain a Directorate of Posts and Telegraphs at Hyderabad after a disintegration of the State ;

(b) the total number of posts and telegraphs offices that will be included in Mysore and Maharashtra States; and

(c) whether it is a fact that Andhra State has a Directorate of Posts and Telegraphs?

The Minister of Communications (Shri Jagjivan Ram) : (a) The question is under examination.

(b) Maharashtra . 4515

Mysore . . 4229

(c) Yes.

Departmental Staff

274. Shri Krishnacharya Joshi : Will the Minister of **Communications** be pleased to state what is the total number of departmental staff working in Hyderabad State at present?

The Minister of Communications (Shri Jagjivan Ram) : Departmental —4,617.

Post Offices

275. Shri Krishnacharya Joshi Will the Minister of **Communications** be pleased to state :

(a) total number of new type of Post Offices to serve the villages opened during 1956; and

(b) if so, whether they are fully equipped with necessary materials?

The Minister of Communications (Shri Jagjivan Ram) : (a) No new type of post offices were opened during 1956. However, 3638 rural post offices have already been opened from 1-1-1956 to 30-6-1956 and 2159 rural post offices are proposed to be opened during the remaining part of the year 1956.

(b) Almost all the Post Offices opened are fully equipped. There are a few cases where some items like letter boxes, locks and ink pads could not be supplied immediately on the opening of the offices. This was due to various reasons such as shortage of steel required for manufacture of letter boxes, failure of the contractors in supplying packing material, resulting in delay in supply of ink pads, and the inability on the part of the manufacturers on whom orders were placed by the Director General, Supplies and Disposals for the supply of locks.

Examination of Inspectors and Head-Clerks

276. Shri Ram Krishan : Will the Minister of **Communications** be pleased to state :

(a) whether it is a fact that Examination of Inspectors of Post Offices and Head Clerks to the Superintendents of Post Offices was held in the month of August, 1955;

(b) if so, how many candidates appeared;

(c) whether the result has been decared; and

(d) if not, the reasons for the delay?

The Minister of Communications (Shri Jagjivan Ram) : (a) Yes.

(b) 1,770.

(c) Yes.

(d) The question does not arise

Andaman Forests

277. Shri S. C. Samanta : Will the Minister of **Food and Agriculture** be pleased to refer to the reply given to Unstarred Question No. 923 on the 11th April, 1956 and state :

(a) the area that was exploited and cleared by M/s P. C. Roy and company during the First Five Year Plan;

(b) how the exploited timbers by the company have been utilised;

(c) how much area was available and how much has been utilised for rehabilitation purposes; and

(d) whether Government received any royalty from the company during the said period?

The Minister of Food and Agriculture (Shri A. P. Jain) : (a)—

	acres
(a) Area exploited . .	14170
(b)—	tons
(i) Timber exported to foreign countries . . .	4811
(ii) Timber exported to Indian markets (mainly for plywood, matches and constructural purposes) .	72853
(iii) Timber utilised at Mayabunder, Andamans for works of improvement .	7774.

(c) 3636 acres were cleared by the Company and utilised for colonisation.

(d) Yes. A sum of Rs. 12,93,537-12-0 has been received as Royalty upto 31st March, 1956.

Mica Mines

278. Shri D. C. Sharma : Will the Minister of **Labour** be pleased to state :

(a) the total number of Mica mine disasters which occurred in India during 1955 as compared to 1953 and 1954; and

(b) the total number of persons killed and injured during each of these years?

The Deputy Minister of Labour (Shri Abid Ali) : (a) The number of accidents which took place in Mica Mine

during the years 1953 to 1955 are as below :—

Year	No. of Accidents	
	Fatal	Serious
1953 . . .	11	28
1954 . . .	10	21
1955 . . .	7	35

(b)—

Year	No. of persons	
	Killed	Seriously injured
1953 . . .	11	46
1954 . . .	12	27
1955 . . .	8	49

Employment Exchange

279. **Dr. Satyawadi** : Will the Minister of Labour be pleased to state:

(a) the number of "Freshers" registered at the Delhi Employment Exchange from the 1st April, 1955 to the 31st March, 1956;

(b) the number of those who have secured employment; and

(c) the number of such registered freshers who have not been given a single chance during the year and the reason thereof?

The Deputy Minister of Labour (Shri Abid Ali) : (a) to (c). The information asked for is given below:

(a) Number of Freshers registered at the Regional Employment Exchange, Delhi from 1-4-55 to 31-3-56 .	20,460
(b) Number of those who secured employment . .	1,349
(c) Number of such registered freshers who have not been given a single chance during the year and the reason thereof	(i) 17,435
	(ii) For lack of an adequate number of vacancies against which freshers could be submitted.

Second Class Travel

280. **Dr. Satyawadi** : Will the Minister of **Railways** be pleased to state:

(a) the number of lines on which the Second Class has been withdrawn in each zone; and

(b) the arrangements made for the passengers holding Second Class tickets on the main line to travel by those branch lines?

The Deputy Minister of Railways and Transport (Shri Alagesan): (a)—

Railway	No. of lines from which 2nd class accommodation has been withdrawn with effect from 1-7-1956.
South-Eastern .	Nil.*
Western . .	13**
North-Eastern .	16
Central . .	8
Southern . .	12**
Eastern . .	8
Northern . .	13
Total .	70

*Railway proposes to withdraw 2nd Class accommodation from 14 sections with effect from 1-8-1956.

**Inclusive of lines as indicated below from which 2nd class accommodation has been withdrawn from certain trains only:—

Western . .	7
Southern . .	1
TOTAL . . .	8

(b) Arrangements have been made by Railways to issue combined 2nd-*cum*-1st or 2nd-*cum*-3rd class tickets as demanded by such passengers.

Urban Water Supply and Drainage Schemes

281. **Sardar Iqbal Singh** :
Sardar Akarpuri :

Will the Minister of **Health** be pleased to state :

(a) the amount of loans offered to Punjab and PEPSU for Urban Water Supply and Drainage Schemes up to 1955-56;

(b) the amount utilised during the same period;

(c) the programme for 1956-57; and

(d) the names of the schemes for which loan has been sanctioned?

The Minister of Health (Rajkumari Amrit Kaur) : (a) *Punjab.* Out of Rs.75 lakhs allocated, Rs. 46·875 lakhs were paid upto 1955-56.

Pepsu. Out of Rs. 15 lakhs allocated, Rs. 3·75 lakhs were paid upto 1955-56.

(b) *Punjab.*—Rs. 15,57,436/-.

Pepsu.—Nil.

(c) *Punjab.*—In addition to the Schemes started in the First Five Year Plan period, new schemes costing Rs. 105 lakhs are proposed to be started by the State Government.

Pepsu.—1. Bhatinda Water Supply Schemes costing Rs. 63,000.

2. The Narwana Water Supply Scheme costing Rs. 2,28,741/-.

3. The Jind Water Supply Scheme costing Rs. 88,259/-.

(d) *Punjab*—.

Amritsar	Water Supply Scheme.
Jullundur	Do.
Ludhiana	Do.
Muktsar	Do.
Ambala	Do.
Kalka	Do.
Jamna Nagar	Do.
Rupar	Do.
Hissar	Do.
Bhiwani	Do.
Kabwali	Do.
Rohtak	Do.
Rewari	Do.
Karnal	Do.
Amritsar	Drainage Scheme.
Pathankot	Do.
Jullundur	Do.
Ludhiana	Do.
Gidderbha	Do.
Moga	Do.
Hissar	Do.
Kabwali	Do.
Rohtak	Do.
Nurpur	Water Supply Scheme.
Ferozepur	Do.
Moga	Do.
Kalan Wali Mandi	Do.
Hansi	Do.
Palampur	Do.
Simla	Do.
Sumrala	Drainage Scheme.
Hansi	Do.
Gurgaon	Do.
Jagadhri	Do.
Simla	Do.
Sirsa	Do.
Hoshiarpur	Do.

PEPSU—

Narnaul	Water Supply Scheme.
Do.	Drainage Scheme.
Bhatinda	Water Supply Scheme.
Nalagarh	Do.
Do.	Drainage Scheme.
Malerkotla	Water Supply Scheme.
Do.	Drainage Scheme.
Dharampur	Water Supply Scheme.
Mahendargarh	Do.
Samana	Do.
Ateli	Do.
Phagwara	Drainage Scheme.
Hadyaya	Do.
Narwana	Do.
Julana	Do.
Patiala	Water Supply Scheme.
Nabha	Do.
Faridkot	Do.
Chail	Do.
Kandaghat	Do.
Saproom	Do.

Delhi Road Transport Authority

282. Sardar Iqbal Singh : Will the Minister of **Transport** be pleased to state the steps taken by Government to improve the efficiency of the Delhi Road Transport Authority and the regularity and punctuality of its services ?

The Deputy Minister of Railways and Transport (Shri Alagesan) : A statement is laid on the Table of the Lok Sabha [*See* Appendix III, annexure No. 44].

Corruption Cases in Northern Railway

283. Sardar Iqbal Singh : Will the Minister of **Railways** be pleased to state:

(a) the number of employees on the Northern Railway dealt with for corruption either Departmentally or otherwise during 1955-56; and

(b) the number of those whose cases were taken to courts and who were prosecuted during the same period ?

The Deputy Minister of Railways and Transport (Shri Alagesan) : (a) 108.

(b) 9.

Posts and Telegraphs Offices in Punjab and Pepsu

284. {Sardar Iqbal Singh: Sardar Akarpuri :

Will the Minister of **Communications** be pleased to state the programme regarding opening of posts and telegraphs offices in Punjab and Pepsu for 1956-57 ?

The Minister of Communications (Shri Jagjivan Ram) : It is proposed to open 104 Posts Offices and 29 Combined Posts and Telegraphs Offices in Punjab and 52 Post Offices and 3 Combined Posts and Telegraphs Offices in Pepsu during 1956-57.

Construction of a Bridge in Travancore-Cochin State

285. **Shri A. K. Gopalan** : Will the Minister of **Transport** be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government have any schemes to construct a bridge connecting the industrial town of Quilon (in Travancore-Cochin) and the Coir producing areas of Purnad;

(b) if so, the details of the scheme;

(c) when the work will commence and when it is expected to be over; and

(d) the estimated expenditure for construction of the bridge ?

The Deputy Minister of Railways and Transport (Shri Alagesan) : (a) and (b). The State Plan includes a Scheme for the construction of a high level bridge about 700 ft. long suitable for double line traffic.

(c) The work will be commenced during the current financial year and is expected to be completed before the end of the Second Five Year Plan period.

(d) About Rs. 12 lakhs.

Scheduled Tribes

286. **Shri Rishang Keishing** :
Shri Balmiki :

Will the Minister of **Railways** be pleased to state:

(a) the figure of the Scheduled Tribes employed in the Indian Railway Service during the past four years of the First Five Year Plan;

(b) what percentage out of the reservation in the railway service for the scheduled tribed has been filled up; and

(c) whether any special effort is being made by the Government to fill up the reserved quotas ?

The Deputy Minister of Railways and Transport (Shri Alagesan): (a) and (b). A statement is laid on the Table of the Lok Sabha [*See* Appendix III, annexure No. 45].

(c) Yes.

Fans in Waiting Rooms

287. **Shri Rishang Keishing:** Will the Minister of **Railways** be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government are aware of the fact that in important railway stations in Assam as Bongaigaon, Lamding, Manipur Road etc., railway offices and waiting rooms for the passengers are not provided with electric fans;

(b) if so, the reason therefor ;

(c) the present arrangements in place of electric fans in those stations; and

(d) the arrangements proposed for the supply of electric fans at these stations ?

The Deputy Minister of Railways and Transport (Shri Alagesan): (a) Electric fans are provided in the offices and waiting rooms at Bongaigaon, Lumding, Manipur Road and at several other important stations in Assam where electric power is available.

(b) Does not arise.

(c) At some stations where electric fans do not exist, pull *punkhas* have been provided.

(d) A number of additional stations are proposed to be electrified in the 2nd Five Year Plan period and fans will then be provided at such stations.

Homoeopathic Pharmacopoea

288. **Shri S. C. Samanta** : Will the Minister of **Health** be pleased to refer to the reply given to Starred Question No. 2724 on the 28th May 1956 and state :

(a) the steps taken to prepare a Homoeopathic Pharmacopoea in India;

(b) who has been entrusted with the work; and

(c) how long it will take to complete the work ?

The Minister of Health (Rajkumari Amrit Kaur) : (a) The matter is still under consideration.

(b) and (c). Do not arise.

Railway Parcels

289. **Shri S. C. Samanta** : Will the Minister of **Railways** be pleased to refer to the reply given to Unstarred Question No. 457 on the 19th March, 1956 and state the steps taken to quicken the despatch and delivery of parcels between Howrah and Contai Road Stations ?

The Deputy Minister of Railways and Transport (Shri Alagesan): An Organisation has been set up at the headquarters of the South Eastern Railway to specially watch the working of the arrangements for the clearance and movement of parcels traffic. As a result of this, improvement in the position regarding the movement of parcels *inter alia* between Howrah and Contai Road stations is expected.

Conference of State Ministers of Cooperation

290. **Shri Shree Narayan Das** :
Ram Krishan :

Will the Minister of **Food and Agriculture** be pleased to state:

(a) the nature of important subjects discussed and considered at the Conference of State Ministers of Co-operation recently held at Mussouri;

(b) the precise nature of decisions taken and recommendations made by the Conference;

(c) whether Government have considered the recommendations; and

(d) if so, their reaction and decision in this regard ?

The Minister of Food and Agriculture (Shri A. P. Jain) : (a) and (b). The Conference discussed and considered the implementation of the schemes of Co-operative development included in the Second Five Year Plan. The resolutions on important subjects passed in the Conference are placed on the Table of the Sabha. [Placed in the Library. *See* No. S-277/56.]

(c) The recommendations are under the consideration of the Government.

(d) Does not arise.

Employees Provident Funds

291. **Shri Krishnacharya Joshi** : Will the Minister of **Labour** be pleased to state the total number of persons who have been benefited by the Employees Provident Fund Scheme during the current year so far ?

The Deputy Minister of Labour (Shri Abid Ali) : Over 16 lakh workers have been covered by the Scheme since its inception in November, 1952. 10,200 workers covered by the Statutory Scheme, obtained refund of their accumulations during the current year until 30-4-56.

Loss to Railways by Floods

292. **Shri Sanganna** : Will the Minister of **Railways** be pleased to state :

(a) whether any loss to railway properties has been incurred in the recent floods in the different States of the country;

(b) if so, the nature of property involved in each zone;

(c) whether any slackness or negligence on the part of the official machinery is responsible to any extent for such loss; and

(d) whether any precautions had been taken to avoid the loss ?

The Deputy Minister of Railways and Transport (Shri Alagesan) : (a) to (d). The information is being collected and will be laid on the Table of the Lok Sabha in due course.

Railway Station at Ballidangni

293. **Shri N. B. Chowdhury** : Will the Minister of **Railways** be pleased to state :

(a) whether several representations have been made to Government regarding the necessity of having a new Railway Station at Ballidangni between Panchkura and Haur stations in the South Eastern Railway; and

(b) if so, whether the matter has been considered by Government?

The Deputy Minister of Railways and Transport (Shri Alagesan) : (a) A representation was received recently from the President Panchkura Union Board and others.

(b) The matter is under consideration.

Railway Accident near Itarsi

294. **Shri Kamath** : Will the Minister of **Railways** be pleased to state :

(a) whether it is a fact that a railway accident took place very recently near Itarsi;

(b) if so, what trains were involved ; and

(c) the details of the accident ?

The Deputy Minister of Railways and Transport (Shri Alagesan) : (a) to (c). At about 12·45 hours on 13-7-1956, while No. 17 Up Through Goods train, ex Amla to Itarsi, was running between Barbatpur and Dhodramohar stations on the Amla-Itarsi single line section of the Central Railway, 5 wagons on the train—31st to 35th from the engine—derailed at mile 494/21.

शाहबाद में टेलीफोन विनिमय-केंद्र

२९५. **डा० सत्यवादी** : क्या संचार मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) क्या यह सच है कि शाहबाद (करनाल) की जनता ने यह मांग की है

कि वहां पर एक टेलीफोन विनिमय-केन्द्र स्थापित किया जाय और और वह इस संबंध में सारी जरूरी शर्तें पूरी करती है ;

(ख) यदि हां, तो इस विनिमय-केन्द्र की स्थापना में विलम्ब का कारण क्या है ; और

(ग) यह विनिमय-केन्द्र कब तक स्थापित हो जाने की संभावना है ?

संचार मंत्री (श्री जगजीवन राम) : (क) जी हां ।

(ख) सामान आने में देरी ।

(ग) लगभग तीन महीने में ।

Road in Tripura

206. Shri Biren Dutt : Will the Minister of **Transport** be pleased to state :

(a) whether the road linking Kurti *via* Kadmtala to Dharmanagar in Tripura is under contemplation of the State Government; and

(b) if so, when it is expected to be taken up ?

The Deputy Minister of Railways and Transport (Shri Alagesan) : (a) No, Sir.

(b) Does not arise.

DAILY DIGEST

[*Monday, 30th July, 1956*]

	Columns
ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS	541—69

S.Q. No.	Subject	Columns
451	Cost of Living Index	541—43
452	"Kashmir Princess"	543—44
453	Rice Milling Committee	544—45
454	Free Travel for State Legislature Members	545—47
456	Railway Stores	547—49
457	Cattle Dung	549—50
458	Maternity Centres in PEPSU	550—51
459	Farmers' Forum	551—52
460	Export of *Chira* from Manipur	552—54
462	Shipping Companies	554—55
463	Regional Employment Exchange, Hyderabad	555—56
466	Tunnel under Brahmaputra	556
468	Barbil Iron and Manganese Mines	557—58
469	Sugar	558—59
471	P. & T. Department, Travancore-Cochin	559—61
472	Serai-Rohilla Station	561—63
473	Illegal Telephone Exchanges	563
474	Tourism	563—64
475	Railway Tools Factories	565
476	Oudh-Tirhut Mail	565—66
477	Co-operative Sugar Factories	566—68
479	Late running of Trains	568—69
480	Watter Supply Schemes in Assam	569
	WRITTEN ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS	569—98
448	National Agricultural Credit Fund	569—70
449	Wheat from U. S. A.	570
450	Telco Locomotives	570—71
455	Over-crowding in Trains	571
461	Ship Building	571—72
464	Constellation Aeroplanes	572
465	Assam Rail-Link	572—73
467	Supply of Rice to Philippines	573
470	Railway Stores from U.S.S.R.	573
478	Monsoon Damage to Railways	573—74
481	Muzaffarpur-Darbhanga Track	574
482	Tractors	574
483	Oilseeds Crushing Industry Enquiry Committee	574—75
484	Agricultural Research and Education	575
485	Delhi Junction	575—76
486	Locust Invasion	576
487	Prices of Coconuts	576
488	Iron and Manganese Ore Mines	576—77
489	Food Situation in Naga Hills	577
490	Hotel Training Schools	578
491	Madras-Delhi Janata	578
492	Amritsar Workshop	578
493	Civil Aviation Training Centre	579
494	Central Board of Forestry	579
495	Railway Line to Garo Hills	580
496	Tourism	580
497	Catering Contractors	580—81
498	P. & T. Employees	581
499	Divisional System on Railways	582
500	Employment Exchanges in West Bengal	582

U. S. Q. No.		
262	Wagon Factory at Bharatpur	582
263	Regional Employment Advisory Committee	582—83
264	Irrigation	583
265	Railway Line Capacity	583
266	Accident at Santa Cruz Aerodrome	583—84
267	Engine Derailment	584—85
268	Air Accidents	585
269	Wheat Reserves	585
270	Bhopal-Bina Line	585—86
271	Food Godown in Madras	586
272	Hassan-Mangalore Railway Project	586
273	Directorate of Posts and Telegraphs, Hyderabad	586
274	Departmental Staff	587
275	Post Offices	587
276	Examination of Inspectors and Head-Clerks	587
277	Andaman Forests	588
278	Mica Mines	588—89
279	Employment Exchange	589
280	Second Class Travel	589—90
281	Urban Water Supply and Drainage Schemes	590—92
282	Delhi Road Transport Authority	592
283	Corruption Cases in Northern Railway	592

WRITTEN ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS—*contd.*

U. S. Q. No.	*Subject*	*Columns*
284	Posts and Telegraphs Offices in Punjab and PEPSU	592
285	Construction of a Bridge in Travancore-Cochin State	593
286	Scheduled Tribes	593
287	Fans in Waiting Rooms	593—94
288	Homoeopathic Pharmacopoeia	594
289	Railway Parcels	594
290	Conference of State Ministers of Co-operation	595
291	Employees Provident Funds	595
292	Loss to Railways by Floods	595—96
293	Railway Station at Ballidangni	596
294	Railway Accident near Itarsi	596
295	Telephone Exchange at Shahabad	596—97
296	Road in Tripura	598

30/7/1956

CONTENTS

	COLUMNS
Paper laid on the Table	1405
Leave of Absence	1405-1406
Election to Committee—	
All-India Institute of Medical Sciences	1406
State Financial Corporations (Amendment) Bill	1406-07
States Reorganisation Bill—	
Motion to consider as reported by Joint Committee	1407—1552
Lala Achint Ram	1408—15
Shri C. D. Deshmukh	1415—29
Shri S. K. Patil	1429—32, 1433—42
Sardar Hukum Singh	1443—60
Shri V. V. Giri	1460—65
Shri Pataskar	1465—79
Shri Thanu Pillai	1480—87
Shri Tulsidas	1487—96
Shri Gopala Rao	1496—1501
Shri S. C. Deb	1501—04
Shri Jawaharlal Nehru	1504—21
Acharya Kripalani	1522—27
Col. Zaidi	1527—31, 1532-33
Shri Ramachandra Reddi	1534—40
Shri Gidwani	1540—48
Shri B. S. Murthy	1548—50, 1551-52
DAILY DIGEST	1553-54

LOK SABHA

Monday, 30th July, 1956

The Lok Sabha met at Eleven of the Clock.

[MR. SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

(See Part I)

12 NOON

PAPER LAID ON THE TABLE

AUDIT REPORT (POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS)

The Minister of Revenue and Civil Expenditure (Shri M. C. Shah): I beg to lay on the Table, under article 151(1) of the Constitution, a copy of the Audit Report (Posts and Telegraphs), 1956—Part I. [*Placed in Library. See* No. S-274/56.]

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. Speaker: The Committee on Absence of Members from the Sittings of the House in its Sixteenth Report has recommended that leave of absence may be granted to the following Members for the periods indicated in the Report:

1. Shri C. Ramasamy Mudaliar.
2. Shri Krishnacharya Joshi.
3. Shri M. Hifzur Rahman.
4. Shri N. Somana.
5. Shri Raj Bahadur.
6. Shri A. E. T. Barrow.
7. Shri Sofi Mohd. Akbar.
8. Maulana Mohammad Saeed Masuodi.
9. Shri R. Velayudhan.

I take it that the House agrees with the recommendations of the Committee.

Hon. Members: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: The Members will be informed accordingly.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE

ALL-INDIA INSTITUTE OF MEDICAL SCIENCES

The Minister of Health (Rajkumari Amrit Kaur): I beg to move

"That in pursuance of clause (g) of Section 4 of the All-India Institute of Medical Sciences Act, 1956, the Members of this House do proceed to elect in such manner as the Speaker may direct, two Members from amongst themselves to be Members of the Institute."

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That in pursuance of clause (g) of Section 4 of the All India Institute of Medical Sciences Act, 1956, the Members of this House do proceed to elect in such manner as the Speaker may direct, two Members from amongst themselves to be Members of the Institute."

The motion was adopted.

STATE FINANCIAL CORPORATIONS (AMENDMENT) BILL*

The Minister of Revenue and Defence Expenditure (Shri A. C. Guha): I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill further to amend the State Financial Corporations Act, 1951.

*Published in the Gazette of India Extra-ordinary Part II—Section 2. dated 30-7-56 pp. 621—634.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill further to amend the State Financial Corporations Act, 1951."

The motion was adopted.

Shri A. C. Guha: I introduce* the Bill.

STATES REORGANISATION BILL—*contd.*

Mr. Speaker: The House will now proceed with the further consideration of the following motion moved by Pandit G. B. Pant on 26th July, 1956:

"That the Bill to provide for the reorganisation of the States of India and for matters connected therewith, as reported by the Joint Committee, be taken into consideration."

Shri Kamath: (Hoshangabad): May I make an earnest request before the House proceeds with the debate? You are well aware that the debate has evoked much interest both inside as well as outside the House. Many hon. Members are still anxious to speak on this Bill. I would, therefore, request you to extend the time for discussion till tomorrow—I mean the general discussion and, *pari passu*, I would request you to increase the total time allotted for this Bill, with exercise of your discretionary powers to increase the time from 45 to 55 hours or round about that.

Secondly, you are aware that the observance of the *punya tithi* of Lokamanya Tilak falls on Wednesday—the day after tomorrow. Many of us are anxious to take part in this in our constituencies and other parts of the country. I would, therefore, earnestly request you to take up the second reading of this Bill, say, on Friday or Monday—not before Friday in any case, so that we may be here to participate in the voting on the various clauses. That may also give sometime for Members to have talks outside the House on certain controversial clauses, such as Bombay. These two days, in the meantime, Wednesday and Thursday, may be utilised for the River Boards Bill, etc.

Shri Tulsidas (Mehsana West): I support what Shri Kamath has said that the time for the first reading may be extended by one day more in order that the hon. Members who may like to speak may have enough time.

Mr. Speaker: Let us consider. Let us see how the progress is and then come to this matter again. So far as adjourning of the other stage or taking up the other stage at a later date is concerned, the hon. Minister of Parliamentary Affairs is also hearing him. He may have a talk with him and if they come to an agreement, I have no objection.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram (Visakhapatnam): There will be a large measure of agreement. (*Interruptions.*)

Mr. Speaker: There is no question of my agreeing. I am here from 11 A.M. till 6 P.M.

लाला अचित राम (हिसार) : अध्यक्ष जी, सबसे पहले मैं यह अर्ज करना चाहता हूं कि इस मौके पर भी कहीं कहीं यह आवाज उठती है कि स्टेट्स रीआर्गनाइजेशन (राज्य, पुनर्गठन) के मामले को छोड़ दिया जाय, क्योंकि इससे मुल्क को बड़ा नुकसान पहुंचेगा। मैं समझता हूं कि यह एक बेहतरीन मौका है जबकि हम इस काम को अपने हाथों में लेकर पायतकमील तक पहुंचा सकते हैं, क्योंकि अभी हमारे मुल्क में बड़े बड़े महान् व्यक्ति, पंडित जी, पंतजी और आजाद साहब मौजूद हैं। इसलिए हमें इस बात का फैसला अभी कर लेना चाहिए।

---

*Introduced with the recommendation of the President.

पन्त जी ने अपनी तकरीर में यह फ़रमाया था कि जो रिपोर्ट (प्रतिवेदन) मैं पेश कर रहा हूं, उस पर बहुत गौरो-खौम किया गया है और हो सकता है कि इससे मुल्क के बाज हल्कों में ग्रैटिफ़िकेशन (प्रसन्नता) न हो, केवल रिलीफ़ (संतोष) हो । मैं यह अर्ज करना चाहता हूं कि इस रिपोर्ट से बहुत से हल्कों में ग्रैटिफ़िकेशन भी हुआ है और रिलीफ तो हुआ ही है । मिसाल के तौर पर पंजाब के मुताल्लिक मैं कह सकता हूं कि हिन्दुस्तान में जो सिख माइनारिटी (अल्प संख्यक) प्राबलम (समस्या) थी, उस को हल करने में गवर्नमेंट को जो कामयाबी हासिल हुई है, वह दरहकीकत एक ऐसा मामला है, जिस पर हम ग्रैटिफ़िकेशन का इजहार कर सकते हैं । लोगों में इससे बहुत तसल्ली और तस्कीन हुई है । खास तौर पर लोहारू के मामले में गवर्नमेंट ने जो फैसला किया है, वह बहुत तसल्ली देने वाला है । इसलिए मैं पन्त जी को यकीन दिलाना चाहता हूं कि उन्होंने जो लेबर (परिश्रम) की है, उससे मुल्क में सिर्फ रिलीफ़ ही नहीं, बल्कि ग्रैटिफ़िकेशन भी हुआ है ।

उन्होंने अपनी तकरीर के दौरान में यह भी फ़रमाया था कि इस हाउस (सभा) को और मुल्क को—यह रिपोर्ट (प्रतिवेदन) कबूल कर लेनी चाहिए । लेकिन साथ ही उन्होंने यह भी कहा कि अगर उस में कुछ इम्प्रूवमेंट (सुधार) की गुंजायश हो, तो वह करने के लिए तैयार हैं, क्योंकि उन की ख्वाहिश है कि सारा मुल्क इस को कबूल करे और जब नए सिरे से यहां पर काम शुरू हो, तो सारे मुल्क की दुआयें उस के साथ हों । इसमें कोई शक नहीं कि उन की ख्वाहिश बड़ी नेक है और मैं उनके साथ इत्तिफ़ाक-राय का इजहार करता हूं । उन के इस आश्वासन को देख कर कि इस स्टेज पर भी वह कुछ इम्प्रूवमेंट करने के लिए तैयार हैं, मैं इस बारे में अपनी आबजरवेशन्ज (धारणाएं) हाउस के सामने रखना चाहता हूं ।

जहां तक पंजाब का ताल्लुक है, मैं महसूस करता हूं कि जो रेमेडी—जो इलाज—इस रिपोर्ट ने पेश की है, उससे टू-थर्ड (दो तिहाई) प्राबलम (समस्या) हल हो गई है । उससे लोगों को तसल्ली भी हुई है । लेकिन इस बात से इंकार नहीं किया जा सकता कि पंजाब का एक तिहाई तबका, जिसकी आबादी पचास लाख के करीब होगी, इससे सैटिसफ़ाइड नहीं हुआ है—उसमें तस्कीन नहीं हुई है । मैं यह नहीं कहता कि जो इलाज किया गया है, वह इलाज निकम्मा है । यह मेरा दावा नहीं है । इस बारे में दो बातें हो सकती हैं—या तो इलाज अच्छा नहीं है या जिस तरीके से दवाई बनाई गई है या एडमिनिस्टर (प्रयोग) की गई है; वह तरीका गलत है । यह बात साफ़ है कि पंजाब की एक तिहाई आबादी एक्यूट पेन (सख्त दर्द) में है—तकलीफ़ में है । हमें देखना यह है कि नुक्स कहां पर है । मैं समझता हूं कि जहां तक ताल्लुक है दवाई के इनग्रैडिएन्ट्स (अंशों) का, वे तो ठीक मालूम पड़ते हैं, लेकिन जिस तरीके से दवाई तैयार की गई है, जिस तरीके से दवाई एडमिनिस्टर की गई है, मुझे शक है कि उसमें नुक्स है । मैं देखता हूं कि जिस तरीके से यह बिल पेश किया जा रहा है, उस में भी नुक्स है । आप पूछेंगे कि कैसे ? इस वक्त तक तमाम हिन्दुस्तान में यह बात मालूम हो चुकी है और आम जनता भी महसूस करती है, कांग्रेस के नेता भी महसूस करते हैं, हाई कमांड के मेम्बर भी महसूस करते हैं कि पंजाब में कहीं न कहीं कोई तकलीफ़ जरूर है । लेकिन होम मिनिस्टर साहब की तकरीर में मुझे एक लफ्ज भी ऐसा नजर नहीं आया, जिससे जाहिर हो कि हिन्दुस्तान के किसी हिस्से में—पंजाब में—इस बारे में कोई बेचैनी है या डिस्सेटिस्फैक्शन (असंतोष) है या शान्ति नहीं है । मैं समझता हूं कि फैक्ट्स (तथ्यों) को इग्नोर (उपेक्षा) करने से काम नहीं चल सकता है। फैक्ट्स को फ़ेस (मुकाबला) करने से ही यह मसला हल हो सकता है । आज हम को देखना है कि गलती कहां है और अगर वह हम को मालूम हो जाय, तो हम उस को फ़ौरन ठीक कर सकते हैं ।

[लाला अचित राम]

इन हालात में मैं तो यही कहूंगा कि आज गवर्नमेंट आफ इंडिया को वही तरीका इस्तैमाल करना चाहिए जो कि सरदार पटेल ने इस्तैमाल किया था। वह तरीका क्या था ? जिस वक्त कि सन् १९४७ में पंजाब में गड़बड़ी मच रही थी, और एक दूसरे का गला काट रहा था, लोगों से अपीलें की जाती थीं कि प्रेम से रहो लेकिन कोई सुनता नहीं था। उस वक्त सरदार पटेल खुद अमृतसर पहुंचे और लोगों से कहा कि यह तुम क्या कर रहे हो। उन्होंने लोगों को समझाया कि इसमें न तो हिन्दुओं का भला है और न मुसलमानों का भला है। नतीजा यह हुआ कि २४ घंटे के अन्दर, जो लड़ाई हो रही थी और गले कट रहे थे, वे बन्द हो गये। क्या मिरेकिल (चमत्कार) हो गया ? इस बिल के लिये सात दिन रखे गये हैं और इसमें मोटे मोटे तीन मसले हैं, १. बम्बई का, २. पंजाब का और ३. बाउंडरी का। पंजाब के हिस्से में इस में से दो दिन आवेंगे। मैं महसूस करता हूं कि बजाय इसके कि हम इन दो दिनों तक यहां बहस करें और बिल को पास करें, आल इंडिया नेताओं को अमृतसर, लुधियाना, जालंधर, होशियारपुर और पठानकोट जाना चाहिए और लोगों को समझाना चाहिए। मैं समझता हूं कि यह ज्यादा अच्छा होगा बनिस्बत इस बिल को पास करने के। हम लोग भी जा सकते हैं लेकिन हमारे जाने से वह काम नहीं होगा। सरदार पटेल ने यह नहीं कहा था कि अचितराम तुम जाओ। वह खुद गये क्योंकि जो ताला लगाता है वही उसको खोलना भी जानता है। हम तो जाने के लिए तैयार हैं लेकिन वह जाये जिसने यह फैसला किया है। जिस आदमी को यह विश्वास है कि मेरी दवा अक्सीर है उसको विश्वास के साथ जाना चाहिए। यह ख्याल करना मुनासिब नहीं है कि लोग होस्टाइल डिमांस्ट्रेशन (विरोधी प्रदर्शन) करें इसलिए नहीं जाना चाहिए। अगर लोगों को यह मालूम हो जायेगा कि यह उनके भले की बात है तो वे रास्ते पर आ जायेंगे। यह ठीक है कि बाज आदमियों की बिला वजह शोर मचाने की आदत होती है। बीमार बाज दफ़ा बीमार नहीं होता लेकिन शोर मचाता है। लेकिन अगर वह दवा खाता है और मोटा होता जाता है तो मालूम हो जायेगा कि जो वह कहता है वह गलत है। आप खुद जाकर हालात देखें और लोगों को बतलायें तो यह बात साफ हो जायेगी। जिस तरह से कि पहले सरदार पटेल ने मासेज (लोगों) को अपने साथ कर लिया था वैसा ही अब भी किया जा सकता है। यह मेरी तजवीज है। मैं कोई स्पेसिफिक रेमेडी (निश्चित निदान) तो नहीं बतला सकता। मैं समझता हूं कि अगर हमारे लीडर सरदार हुक्म सिंह, मास्टर तारासिंह, सरदार राड़ेवाला या पन्त जी जाकर देखें और कोशिश करें तो नतीजा निकल सकता है। लेकिन जो रवैया हमारा पार्लियामेंट में इस बिल को पेश करते वक्त रहा, जो रवैया हमारा इस पर सिलेक्ट कमेटी में बहस करते वक्त रहा और जो रवैया इस वक्त है, उससे हम पब्लिक को रिकंसाइल (समझाना) नहीं कर सकते। मैं नहीं समझता कि इस बिल को यहां दो दिन में पास कर देने से यह मसला हल हो जायेगा। मेरी नाकिस (अकिंचन) राय में इससे वह मसला हल नहीं होगा। लेकिन आखिर में जो आप करेंगे उसको हम मानेंगे।

दूसरी बात मुझे हिमाचल के मुताल्लिक कहनी है। हिमाचल एक सी० क्लास स्टेट (भाग ग राज्य) है मुल्क में एक हवा चली कि सी० क्लास स्टेट्स नहीं रहनी चाहिये और इस हवा में एस० आर० सी० (राज्य पुनर्गठन आयोग) ने रिकमेंड (सिफारिश) किया कि हिमाचल को पंजाब के साथ मिला देना चाहिये। लेकिन गवर्नमेंट (सरकार) ने यह समझा कि यह मुनासिब नहीं है। उसके सामने दो सवालात आ सकते थे। एक यह कि जो अकाली दल से समझौता हुआ है उसकी वजह से हिमाचल को न मिलाया

जाये, दूसरा यह हो सकता है कि वहां लोगों की यह राय है कि वे मिलना नहीं चाहते। जहां तक अकाली दल के साथ समझौते का सवाल है, उसके बारे में कहा गया है कि उसमें कोई सीक्रेट (गुप्त) बात नहीं है। इसलिये यह नहीं कहा जा सकता कि हिमाचल को किसी सीक्रेट मुआहिदे की वजह से नहीं मिलाया जा रहा है। दूसरी बात यह कही जा सकती है कि हिमाचल के लोग नहीं चाहते कि उन को पंजाब के साथ मिलाया जाये। यह बात माकूल हो सकती है। लेकिन हमारा तजुर्बा यह है कि ऐसे मामलों में हमेशा लोगों की राय नहीं मानी जाती जैसा कि दिल्ली के बारे में हुआ। इस वास्ते लोग कहते हैं इसलिये ऐसा किया जा रहा है यह बात भी अमल से ठीक नहीं मालूम देती।

यह बात उसूली तौर पर ठीक है कि जो लोगों की ख्वाहिश है वह पूरी की जाये। हम देखना चाहते हैं कि हिमाचल के लोगों की क्या ख्वाहिश है। उनकी दो ख्वाहिशें हैं, एक तो यह कि उनको डिमाक्रेटिक सेट अप (लोकतन्त्र व्यवस्था) दिया जाये, वहां की विधान सभा ने भी इस बारे में प्रस्ताव पास किया है। दूसरे वे यह चाहते हैं कि उनका एरिया (क्षेत्र), बैकवर्ड (पिछड़ा हुआ) है, उसको डेवेलप (विकास) किया जाये। मैं समझता हूं कि हर एक आदमी की यह ख्वाहिश होगी और गवर्नमेंट भी उनकी ख्वाहिशों को पूरा करना चाहती होगी। मैं पूछता हूं कि क्या उनकी ख्वाहिशों को पूरा किया गया है। आज उनके कहने के बावजूद, उनके प्रस्ताव पास करने के बावजूद, जो रिपोर्ट आयी है वह उनको डिमाक्रेटिक सेट अप नहीं दे रही है। क्या कोई रास्ता नहीं है कि हम उनको डिमाक्रेटिक सेट अप दे सकें। मैं अदब से अर्ज करना चाहता हूं कि इस सिलसिले में आप दो तीन चीजों पर गौर कर लें। आपने पंजाबी जोन (प्रदेश) के लिये और हिन्दी जोन (प्रदेश) के लिये रीजनल कमेटीज (प्रादेशिक समितियां) रखी हैं। मैं, अदब से अर्ज करूंगा कि यही तरीका हिमाचल के लिये भी क्यों न इस्तेमाल किया जाये। ऐसा करने से उनको डिमाक्रेटिक सेट अप भी मिल जायेगा। मैं समझता हूं कि यह आसान तरीका है। ऐसा करने से उनकी ख्वाहिश भी पूरी हो जायेगी और वे अल्टीमेटली (अन्ततः) पंजाब में भी मिल जावेंगे। आप देखें कि इस तजदिज में क्या नुक्स है : मेरी राय में तो यह बिल्कुल ठीक मालूम देती है। अगर अकाली पार्टी से कोई सीक्रेट मुआहिदा नहीं है, तो फिर सरकार को यही चीज करनी चाहिये। मैं समझता हूं कि पब्लिक (जनता) के किसी हिस्से को पांच सात साल डिमाक्रेटिक सेट अप में रख कर फिर उससे उसे छीन लेना मुनाबिस नहीं है। अगर आप इस को पंजाब के साथ नहीं मिलाना चाहते तो इसको काश्मीर के साथ मिलाइये। ऐसा करने से भी इसको डिमाक्रेटिक सेट अप मिल जायेगा और इसका डेवलपमेंट भी होगा। लेकिन आप कह सकते हैं कि कुछ ऐसी बातें हैं कि जिन की वजह से हम ऐसा नहीं कर सकते। तो न कीजिये। लेकिन मैं यह चाहता हूं कि आप ऐसा कुछ करें कि हिमाचल को डिमाक्रेटिक सेटअप मिल सके। वहां मौजूदा डिमाक्रेटिक सेट अप रहने दीजिये। आप हिमाचल और पंजाब का कामन गवर्नर (सामूहिक राज्यपाल) कर दीजिये, कामन पब्लिक सरविस कमीशन (सामूहिक लोक सेवा आयोग) और कामन हाई कोर्ट कर दीजिये। अगर आप उनकी ख्वाहिश को पूरा करना चाहते हैं तो उसके लिये रास्ते हैं, और ऐसा कर के आप स्टेट को मजबूत बनायेंगे।

एक बात मैं बम्बई के मुताल्लिक अर्ज करना चाहता हूं। मैं अपनी बेबसी और मजबूरी का इजहार एक आध मिनट में करना चाहता हूं। मेरी समझ में नहीं आता कि हिन्दुस्तान में अपनी राय को बतलाने का क्या तरीका होगा। कौनसा तरीका कोई इस्तेमाल करे कि उसकी आवाज सुनाई दे। मामूली रास्ता यह है कि दरखास्त करो, लेकिन अगर दरखास्त से काम न चले तो क्या किया जाये ? अगर दरखास्त से काम न हो तो

[लाला अचित राम]

इस्तीफा दे दो । अगर इस्तीफे से भी काम न हो तो क्या किया जाये ? अगर इस्तीफे से भी काम न हो तो सत्याग्रह करो । लेकिन अगर इनमें से किसी से भी काम न हो तो क्या किया जाये ?

प्रतिरक्षा संगठन मंत्री (श्री त्यागी) : पार्लियामेंट में तकरीरें करो ।

लाला अचित राम : तकरीरें भी बहुत हो चुकीं । अब इसके बाद कौनसा रास्ता है ? अब और कौन सा रास्ता है जिससे कि कोई अपने दिल की बात कह सके और वह मानी जा सके । मैं चाहता हूं कि इसका कोई जवाब दे ।

Mr. Speaker: Shri C. D. Deshmukh.

Shri C. D. Deshmukh (Kolaba): How much time have I got, Sir?

Mr. Speaker: Up to 30 minutes. The maximum is 30 minutes.

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member may come to one of the front benches.

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: I am all right; I know my place.

Mr. Speaker: The reporters may not be able to hear.

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: For the benefit of the reporters, I shall come to the front.

Sir, how true is the old maxim which runs as follows:

अप्रियस्य च पथ्यस्य च वक्ता श्रोता च दुर्लभः

I find that quite a number of people have been upset by the plain-speaking in which I indulged the other day for reasons out of my control. One Member went to the length of raking up my past although I left the Civil Service about 15 years ago. Sir, that Member has an open mouth on three subjects and a closed mind on the rest. Therefore, I do not think that the House will take much notice of what he has said. I look back on my past and find nothing for which I need reproach myself.

In regard to the subject of today's discussion, I wish to make the following points and if time permits, I shall try and develop them. First, I ascribed no animus personally to the Prime Minister. It has not even been mentioned in the relevant sentence of my statement. If you will permit me, I shall read it again:

> "That the ruling party should have thought in fit to order an enquiry into the Hoshiarpur lathi charge, when they resolutely refused to order an enquiry into the Bombay firing, to my mind, shows an animus against Maharashtra with which I refuse to associate myself".

You will find that here there is no personal reference to the Prime Minister and indeed when the Congress party decided to order an enquiry into the Hoshiarpur affair, the Prime Minister was away from the country. In a sense, it was an appeal to him to reconsider this matter in the light of the decision in regard to the Hoshiarpur lathi charge. But I must add that I believe there is some evidence of animus against Maharashtra among important personages in the Congress party, and that is a matter to which I had drawn the Prime Minister's attention some weeks ago. I also understand that some proof, which can only be apparent until enquiries are made, has been handed over to him, and it is for him to verify if there is anything in those allegations or not. In any case, I cannot see why in the light of our past relations anybody might think that I was interested in making such a charge against the Prime Minister. I am well aware that he is constitutionally incapable of animus against anybody. But in the changed circumstances, such misunderstandings on the part of other people who are more loyalist than the King himself are not to be wondered at.

"भला गर्दिश फलक की चैन देती है किसे इनशां,
गनीमत यह है कि हम सूरत यहां दो चार बैठे हैं।"

Nobody can help these ups and downs of fortune, but it is a consoling thought that a few more like me are here.

My complaint that the two crucial decisions regarding Bombay were taken without prior decision of the Cabinet—I did not say, deliberation.—remains unrefuted. The June 3rd statement was, I repeat, in no sense a Government decision. It was given out by Shri Jawaharlal Nehru in the meeting of the All-India Congress Committee and there was no prior consultation with any Member of the Cabinet, at least to my knowledge, and certainly not with me. I have already said in my statement that it was not reported afterwards to the Cabinet although there were—I do not know how many—about a dozen meetings of the Cabinet after the return of the Prime Minister from Bombay. The Joint Committee have been very trustful and magnanimous in basing some observations on a statement which they have never seen. It was only the other day, at my request, that for the first time we—so to speak—officially saw an authentic version of what the Prime Minister has said.

Shri A. M. Thomas (Ernakulam): That statement was placed before the Joint Committee too.

Shri R. D. Misra (Bhlandshahr Distt.): Sir, can matters connected with the Joint Committee be discussed here?

Mr. Speaker: Let him finish. Any particular difference can be heard afterwards.

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: One hon. Member has told me that that statement was placed before the Joint Committee. If so, I do not understand why the Prime Minister said that the proceedings of the A.I.C.C. are not meant for circulation.

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs and Finance (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): I did not say that. May I know when I said that?

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: It is my impression, Sir. When I asked the question, he said that normally the proceedings of the A.I.C.C. are not placed before the House, but that if the hon. Member wanted, he could have a copy of all of them.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: May I enlighten the hon. Member? I said that they are not normally placed on the Table of the House. But they are given publicity all over the place. I said that if the hon. Member wanted it, either it can be placed on the Table of the House or be sent to him.

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: The narrow point was that I thought that the Joint Committee was in the same position as the House. I do not know that they had privileges which were larger than those of the House. Anyway, I had that point to make in regard to that particular decision.

The main point is that the decision was in no sense a Government decision. I should not have made so much of this, but I think that that decision places Maharashtra in a worse position than even if Bombay had been made into a city State—that was the last decision with which I was associated as a Cabinet Minister—because, with the status of a city State, Bombay city need not have waited for five years for deciding whether it should join Maharashtra or not, misbehaviour or no misbehaviour. Moreover, it could decide by a simple majority to join Maharashtra in accordance with the lawful democratic procedure provided by the Constitution itself. In the proposed formula, if a legal provision accompanied by Shri Jawaharlal Nehru's personal assurance is to be so called, that is to say, a formula, then, the exact democratic process is yet to be determined by executive order, as I understand it. I do not think any amendment is coming to the provisions of the Act. It is not beyond the bounds of possibility that the Congress Party may be left to decide the matter. There is no guarantee of a constitutional procedure or a guarantee against any unjustifiable condition regarding majority, that is to say, two-thirds, which

[Shri C. D. Deshmukh]

would be very much worse than the bare majority which is provided by the Constitution. What is more, apart from the constitutional deterioration, shall we say, in an effort to meet the wishes of Maharashtra, during these five years, tension in the Bombay city, as has been already pointed out by several speakers, will continue at a rising tempo. The moralists and escapists of Bombay will open their money bags and I estimate that one or two lakhs of Maharashtrians will have been compelled by economic circumstances to leave Bombay. This is not entirely unfounded. Hon. Members have given figures of Government employees involved. There are about 30,000 people who are likely to be affected. I have figures somewhere here. I have details of how many are in the secretariat, and how many in other offices. It is quite true that to the extent to which the Maharashtra Government are permitted to retain offices in Bombay city—to what extent they will be permitted we do not know—to that extent this problem will be lightened. I believe also that the Prime Minister has some idea that. generally, the people concerned will not suffer especially those of the districts specially affected, namely Thana, Kolaba and Ratnagiri. Although some care could be taken in regard to government servants—the majority of government servants in the Bombay State are Maharashtrians; service is their badge—semi-government servants, corporation and other State employees, I do not believe that Government has any right or any way of preventing private non-Maharashtrian employers from being unsympathetic to Maharashtrian employees. It is quite impossible to estimate the number of people who will be affected this way. This fact is recognised even by some non-Maharashtrian leaders, and I can privately name to the Prime Minister a person of great understanding who could throw some light on this tendency. Therefore, I see the next few years filled with prospects of deepening economic ruin of the Maharashtrians in the Bombay city. That is bad enough for Bombay city. I think it will be bad for the new State of Maharashtra. That State has, in all conscience, a sorry start. But, this condition will impose on it a major rehabilitation problem which it is ill-equipped by its resources or the quality of its leaders to bear.

If Maharashtra is the principal successor State to the present Bombay State, I do not see why it should be deprived of the natural surpluses of the Bombay city. But all that the Joint Committee, ironically enough, has done is to take from those who have not. I refer to the Industrial Finance Corporation. An industrially backward area will have to wait further for its industrialisation.

The hon. Home Minister talked of sweet reasonableness, or,—I forget the words—the spirit of accommodation. I find that so far as the Gujerat leaders are concerned—I repeat, there is no quarrel between peoples—they have secured what they exactly set out to gain 10 years ago: a Maha-Gujerat and in addition a fine new port on which crores of rupees have been spent. The only fly in the ointment is that they had to restore Abu which rightfully belonged to Rajasthan. They have successfully persuaded the party and the Government to deprive Maharashtra of its natural jurisdiction over its only major port—not the port but the port town; the port has a separate authority we all know. All the dock labourers are Maharashtrians,—"ghatis" as they are contemptuously called by the moneybags of Bombay. The only merit of the announcement of 3rd June is and the provision for review is that it eliminates all the lumber of sanctimonious and disingennous argument about the Bombay city—not taken by the Government, but by other people,—serving the interests of India as a whole, the key-stone, as some Member said, of the arch of national prosperity. This would certainly please Calcutta and other big cities, because all these cities are

each in their own way serving the interests of India though they are being ruled by their territorial powers, and it has not been necessary to resort to a surgical operation separating them from their parent state so that they may be better able to serve the interests of the nation.

If one contemplates the possibility of merger in five years, as my hon. friend from Ujjain, Shri Radhelal Vyas, said,—God bless him—one ceases to worry about this galaxy of fallacies. Till now, those in charge of Bombay State thought of Bombay city as their own, that is to say, as belonging to Gujeratis, Maharashtrians and Kannadigas against the rest of India. Only a few months ago there were violent protestations that the Bombay Plan was not bigger because Bombay was able to raise its own resources, income-tax and so on, as if Bombay earned it against the rest of India. Now, on partition, the same parties have discovered that Bombay belongs to the nation. Now, keeping Bombay separate from Maharashtra violates all principles Government has stood for or professed: removal of regional disparities, that is to say, a good area going with a bad area, a rich area going with a poor area—if I may give an example, Rayalaseema going with coastal areas of Andhra and so on. Then it disregards the organic nexus and the give-and-take between a city and its hinterland. Then it ignores the principle of the succour of the poor against exploitation by the rich, and curiously enough the socialist pattern of society is conspicuously absent from these discussions. It also identifies Government positively with the capitalist view of capital formation. In effect, capital can only be formed by the savings of the poor and by labour. The real source of capital formation is the countryside, the peasant. The capitalist is only a cunningly contrived conduit for the use of capital. Therefore, these local options to cities to separate or to remain separate from their hinterland are ethically unjustifiable and economically unsustainable. All cities will only be too glad to have such options for the apparent financial surpluses are there in the cities.

To my mind, this question of local option has to be considered very carefully. There are all kinds of options which are extant—for instance the option of the Centre is there to take over an area which is required for rightful Central purposes and for no other purpose. You cannot give an option to a tehsil or one district to be a State. We talk of viable States. Therefore, one forms some idea of the extent of area and the size of population which will justify statehood. Therefore, if there are border areas or there are small areas, all you ask them is whether they wish to go this side of the border or that side of the border. That is all the option that they should have, and as I have pointed out, so far as a city is concerned, no matter what its population is, it cannot be given an option to separate from its hinterland. It cannot be given any option at all. The only option is that the Central Government could say whether for legitimate Central purposes that City should be taken over. This does not apply to the emergency provisions, and even, I think, under the Constitution, the emergency provision cannot be applied in parts. You cannot take over a city. If you want to take over, you take over the whole State. Otherwise, city and hinterland, town and country must all be one geographically.

There was one hon. Member to whom geography meant nothing. If it means nothing to him, then this whole Bill of territorial reorganisation of States also means nothing to him, and I do not see why he is taking part in these deliberations at all. It is not Shri Shah, it is Shri Dabhi. To him geography means nothing.

Shri S. S. More (Sholapur): Shri Shah advanced the same argument.

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: I do not know. To him it was not a major argument at all. He is apparently of

[Shri C. D. Deshmukh]

the colonial mind. He thinks in the same terms as Portugal in respect of Goa to whom also geography means nothing. They call Goa a province of Portugal, the metropolitan State. That we are violently resisting in the international world. Why should we admit it in the national field?

It is clear that the disciplined and devoted Maharashtrian leaders are to be treated as in the junior class for the next five years. The word has gone round in the serried ranks of the worshippers of mammon in Bombay that they would surely make a mess of things in Bombay. This is not stated openly. These things are never stated openly. We are fighting a phantom here. Through sub-terraneous channels words go round that if Bombay ever falls into the hands of Maharashtrians, they will make a mess of it, they will decentralise. If the Congress President uses the word "decentralise" nobody is alarmed, but if a distinguished Maharashtrian economist uses the word, then the dovecoats are set fluttering. So, they are to have—these Maharashtrian Ministers, not the economists—a period of probation. I fear that because of this they will be starting on their difficult task humbled, discredited and dispirited. Unwittingly, although out of good intention no doubt, they will be divided by the newfangled machinery of separate development boards. It is as if there is some kind of destiny that they shall never, never, never get Bombay City.

They are not allowed to try their hand at the governance of Bombay City singly, although they had ruled it in partnership; but on the partnership of the firm, the majority partner is to be denied the authority to deal with assets within his geographical area, his territorial area because the sagacious minority partner will no longer be there. This seems to me to be a kind of historical retribution on a community which played by no means an insignificant part in the independence struggles of the country during the last 300 years and produced two outstanding Rulers in modern times. I do not refer to the Maharashtrian Ministers from 1937, but to Sayajirao Gaekwad and Madhavrao Scindia. The British for a time classed Marathas as a non-martial race till they needed them for Kut and Keren, Libya and Italy. The Home Minister has classed them as non-sagacious.

The Minister of Home Affairs (Pandit Pant): I never said that word.

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: It is by implication. He said the Marathas have valour and the Gujaratis have sagacity. I do not say the Gujaratis have no valour. I am not making a joke. In every area, only certain portions are martial and in Gujarat, Kathiawar has a very fine warlike and martial history. I do not also claim that among Marathas everybody is valorous. It is only certain districts—Satara, the south of my constituency, Kolaba, where I was born, only those people...

Mr. Speaker: Is it south of his constituency, or the southern portion of his constituency?

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: The southern portion of my constituency—and I was born within six miles of Raigarh.

Therefore, the Home Minister has by implication classed Maharashtrians as non-sagacious. I can understand that. Sagacity left Maharashtra when a certain family of Maharashtra Brahmins left Deorukh in Ratnagiri 250 years ago. Recently only the better part of valour has been in evidence among the leaders of Maharashtra, I mean discretion. But, our Constitution forbids discrimination and inefficiency should not be presumed. The only way the Centre could constitutionally intervene is on proof of inefficiency, and that too as an emergency measure. In other words, I could have understood an argument that Bombay City should belong to Maharashtra now, but in the light of the perfor-

mance of the Maharashtrian Ministers, we shall review the matter. I can understand that. That is not discrimination of a very serious nature, although it is a discrimination. Now, the letter of the Constitution apart, its spirit is surely against the Centre annexing territories, as I said, except for demonstrable Centre-interests, that is to say, the defence of the borders, the provision of a capital for the federation and so on. If ever, God forbid, this country is in difficulties, those who have over-persuaded Government to deprive Maharashtra of Bombay city will be busy black-marketeering and profiteering; maybe, then, Government will think of the common man in Maharashtra, especially, as I said, in Satara and South Kolaba, for more extended help. That help, I can assure you, will always be there, no matter how sore their hearts may be.

Mr Speaker: The hon. Member should try to conclude now.

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: I have only two more points to make, and they would not take very long.

Some Hon. Members: Let him proceed.

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: Bidding Bombay now a sad farewell, I turn to the other victims of political expediency, Belgaum city and some *tehsils* of Belgaum. The 70 per cent rule is, I feel, on mature consideration, wholly wrong, where an existing bilingual State is to be partitioned. It is absurd to stick to large units for administrative convenience, where the whole country is being reorganised territorially, and it is our duty to reduce the discomfort of the people to the minimum; and undoubtedly, these territorial organisations cause inconvenience and discomfort. Therefore, the villages should be taken as units, and I fully support the recommendation that this matter should be left to be decided in the light of general principles to be enunciated here by a properly constituted boundary commission.

Reference has been made to the minority safeguards. In some cases, they are inapplicable. In these five lakhs of people, they do not form 15 per cent of the population, and therefore, those safeguards will not apply to them. In any case, fear has been expressed, which I share, that they might easily prove to be illusory, unless they are embodied in the statute. Now, I wish to add—and here, I venture to speak on behalf of the Maharashtrian leaders, because they told me—that the Maharashtrian leaders will accept 'uniformally' such an arrangement; in other words, they will agree to Akalkot and South Mudhol taluks going to Kannadigas, and all along the border, if necessary.

There is a very peculiar reason here, and that is, whatever happens on the Hindi and Marathi border, so far as the borders involving the frontiers of the Indo-Aryan and Dravidian languages are concerned, it is very necessary to be as precise as you can. In this particular matter, I would point out that north of Goa, the Konkani that is spoken is very closely related to Marathi. In other words, I challenge some Kannada-speaking man that he should listen to the Goa radio with somebody else who does not know Kannada but knows only Marathi, and of course, the Kannada-speaking man must know only Kannada and not Marathi; and let them try to make sense of what the Goa radio says. You will find that it is an Indo-Aryan language. If necessary, you can appoint a small committee to find out what Konkani is. I do not say it is a form of Marathi, because the Konkani speakers get indignant, but I say it is closely related to Marathi; it is an Indo-Aryan tongue. If you take all these factors together, you will find that all these areas even satisfy the 70 per cent rule. I am not speaking against the Kannada-speaking people, but I must speak the truth, and I am prepared to yield the territories which have been transferred, again wrongly, from them to us. As I said, here the Kannada-Speaking people are only less than 30 per cent,

[Shri C. D. Deshmukh]

slightly less than 30 per cent, in these areas.

There is much more I could speak about Belgaum city. Its language has been Marathi. The municipal committee's records have been maintained in Marathi for the last hundred years. 54 per cent of its population is Marathi-speaking as against 24 or 30 per cent of Kannadigas. There has been a piteous appeal from the students of Belgaum city to the Prime Minister asking him to reconsider this matter. They will be without any employment. As for these young boys who are just passing out of college with Marathi as the medium, where are they to seek employment? It is all very well to say, well, the whole of India is open to them; but who wants then, except Bombay? That is to say, again, there will be a rehabilitation problem of the students of Belgaum. Then. there is the question of regional development.

In spite of all these arrangements that you are making, the board arrangements, if they are not split into small units to take care of all these neglected border areas, they are bound to be neglected. Today, Kannadiga officers are going to visit this area to talk about community projects and national extension service in the Kannada language. Not a word of what they say is going to be understood by the people, and yet in the neighbouring Kolhapur, there are Marathi-speaking officers, who are able to attend to all their needs. Why do you increase the number of people first, who will suffer danger, and then provide safeguards to correct that danger, when it is still open to you, even now, to draw a line here instead of there. Nobody loses anything. They are not very rich areas. There are no mineral deposits there except in Supa, where there is some bauxite deposit, I believe, but as for the rest, they are not very rich areas; they are poor areas. Khanapur has a population of 50,000; it is a poor tehsil. Why this craze for territory? I can never understand. All territory, now in India, is a liability and not an asset, because you have to spend money on its development.

Therefore, these regional development boards and regional councils, which are the Governor's special responsibility are not going to help. They are only going to involve the Governor into unpleasant local problems. The best solution would have been for the Planning Commission to be charged with a study of all these regional disparities. We have said so in the National Development Council meeting. The Planning Commission was the right body because it has no special affiliations. It is equally impartial to everybody. And what is more, it has the equipment for making a study of all these regional problems. And it has had very good record. For instance, the Deputy Chairman has been able to pluck, shall I say, a very good solution in regard to the Tungabhadra dispute. Those who know the local circumstances know how difficult it must have been for him to persuade both the parties.

Now, I think, myself, that the country has been disrupted by all these mistakes but not by those who squeal against injustice. There is a notice in the Paris zoo which says 'This animal is wicked, because it defends itself when attacked'. And that is the charge that is made against anyone who speaks out the truth. I am not provincial. I have spent the last fifteen years of my life, at any rate, in the service of the country, which, of course, hon. Members have now decided to overlook, because I indulge in plain-speaking. I am not linguistic. I love languages. I do not know seventeen languages, but I would like to know seventeen languages. I love every language. My library contains as many Gujarati books as Marathi books.

Anyway, my time is passing, and I shall only refer now to one more point, and that is about violence in a

general way. I am not referring to the misbehaviour of Bombay city. But I saw that you allowed one Member to refer to violence, because he said, nothing has happened to merit a review, except violence and intimidation. He even went to the extent of saying that my statement was an open incitement to violence. I hope he is not judging other people by himself.

"दिल है उनका तप्त कराल,
मानों जैसा शीशा लाल"

Now, I say, violence is bad. But I say that unjust non-violence followed by legalised violence is worse, and it points the road to perdition. I prefer the lion to the leech. I shall just finish now with a quotation. And I would draw the Prime Minister's attention very seriously to it. It is from "एक शिकारी से" by अहसान बिन दानिश

"एक शिकारी से"

ऐ अनीसे दश्त ऐ मेरे बहादुर हम मआश,
शेरनी फिर दुनाली से गिरा दो ज़िन्दह बाश
मगर
भेड़िये हों रीछ हों चीते हों या खूंख्वार शेर
दस्तेवादी तक बहादुर हैं नशिस्तां तक दिलेर,
यह कभी आबादियों में आ कर गुरति नहीं,
यह किसानों और मज़दूरों का हक़ खाते नहीं,
इनसे बढ़ कर दरिन्दे हैं शक़ो दिल गुर्गखूं,
चूस लेते हैं जो मजदूरों की शह रग का लहू
उनसे बढ़ कर वे दरिन्दे हैं कि जालिम बरमाला,
घोंट देते हैं अदालत में सदाक्त का गला,
इनसे बढ़ कर वे दरिन्दे हैं बशक्ले राहबर,
दिन दहाड़े लूट लेते हैं जो बेवाओं के घर ।

Shri S. K. Patil (Bombay City—South): Mr. Speaker, Sir, it is rather unfortunate and somewhat embarrassing for me to take the floor after my most esteemed and hon. friend, the ex-Finance Minister. I have nothing against him personally except feelings of friendship.

All these years this question of States reorganisation has been debated in this House time and again, and I have myself taken a lot of time of the House. I do not want to repeat the things that I have said before, but if I do not refer to that dismal and dreary picture of desperation—and uttar desperation—that the *ex*-Finance Minister has laid before this House, I shall be failing in my duty both to my city and to my country. It is only with that view that I shall make a few observations.

My hon friend thinks and assumes—as many people perhaps in this country assume—that we are finally committed that this country must be linguistically divided and geography is the only consideration for such a division. I need not go over the subject that has been discussed before. There were a few people in this country—their number may be very small, and I belong to that class; call them mad, call them anything—who have been cautioning this country that this country has suffered enough in the name of religion for at least 50 years, let us not suffer more in the name of language in this country. If that—call it advice, call it request, call it caution—was really heeded in time, this disaster would not have come. Today, everywhere in the country we find, not only in the city of Bombay—that is, perhaps, the pinpoint, the spearhead—that there has been no peace for the last nine months. We have been considering nothing but the States reorganisation. Everything else is secondary.

Shri Kamath: Withdraw the Bill.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Shri S. K. Patil: It is a difficult subject for my hon. friend to take interest.

Therefore, we have got again to take stock of the situation. As practical men, we know we have travelled so far that it is impossible to go back. If *status quo* was possible even at this stage, I would have an bended

[Shri S. K. Patil]

knees appealed to this Parliament, 'Please do not have this linguistic distribution anywhere in the country; nothing good is going to come out it'. But I know it is not possible. We have gone too far. Some of the problems—whether two-thirds or one-third, I do not know—have been settled and cannot be reopened. The whole world is watching us, and in a crucial hour like this after having gone nine months with this question, we cannot retrace our steps—and that is also a step fraught with disastrous consequences—it is not possible at all. therefore, we have got to consider this question and finally decide it.

My hon. friend, in the line of many other people who have argued this problem all these years and particularly these months, has said that because Bombay happens to be geographically in Maharashtra, therefore, it must go to Maharashtra. These are all arguments well known and oft repeated. We have heard them very often. But are we to be told that because we have to be somewhere, as we are in Bombay, we must go to Maharashtra? It has been my privilege to serve that city for the last 38 years. Never once did we think, never once did the 3½ million citizens of that city think that one day we are going to get the status of being the capital of a purely unilingual State. Thousands and lakhs of people who came there and made Bombay city their home never thought on the lines of language. Otherwise, there would not have been a population which is so distributed in languages that it is almost the whole of India.

An Hon. Member: Every city is like that.

Shri S. K. Patil: Every city is not like that. I have heard it often here.

Some Hon. Members: Every city.

Shri S. K. Patil: Thirty-six years back, when the Indian National Congress attempted a little distribution for its own purposes, why was exception made only for the city of Bombay in the constitution? (*Interruptions*). Where were these linguistic champions in those days?

Shri Kamath: You are a fanatic.

Mr. Speaker: Let there be no interruptions.

Shri S. K. Patil: It is very unpleasant. Perhaps it pinches the hon. Member.

Shri Kamath: You are getting excited.

Shri S. K. Patil: It will pinch much more if he listens silently.

Shri Kamath: I don't feel the pinch at all.

Shri S. K. Patil: Even then, who decided that case? It will bear repetition. Take history. No less a person than the greatest of the Maharashtrians then living, it was Shri N. C. Kelkar who decided it. It was left to his sole discretion as to whether the city of Bombay and its cosmopolitan nature was of a kind that a separate Provincial Congress Committee should be set up. He was to judge. And he decided that the city's complexion was such that it could not merge either with this or that and therefore it must have a separate Pradesh or Provincial Congress Committee. May I ask, all these 36 years that we have been functioning as a separate Pradesh or Provincial Congress Committee, was there any single complaint or objection from anybody? Now, all of a sudden to come to tell that geography alone is going to decide this question, that linguistic division alone is going to decide this question, is something incomprehensible. If it is so, then woe be not only to national unity but to any progress of the country—I believe these are all fundamental considerations which we cannot ignore. Linguistic feelings are tribal feelings. Two hundred years ago or even 50 years ago, I could have understood them. Then

people did not move very much. It was very difficult to do so. Means of communications were not there, but in the year 1956 to say that because of language alone we have got to break up is something horrible, in my eyes.

Shri Jaipal Singh (Ranchi West—Reserved—Sch. Tribes): I hope the hon. Member is referring to ancient tribal feelings and not modern!

Shri S. K. Patil: I did not call them tribals. I said tribal feelings.

Some new points have been made by my hon. friend, Shri C. D. Deshmukh, and they are worthy replying to, because he is a responsible man whose speeches and whose words are considered everywhere in the country with that responsibility to which he is entitled. He said: 'Oh, a City State could have been better, according to him'.

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: I said 'It is worse than the city'.

Shri S. K. Patil: I return the compliment to him. When he said that it would have been worse, I should say, surely it means that this is better. There cannot be one logic for Shri C. D. Deshmukh and another logic for me.

Now, it is good, it would have been better, and that was the reason why the Congress had done it. I understand from Shri C. D. Deshmukh that the Cabinet also had considered it and decided it. May I ask in all humility of my friend, who was responsible for changing that status? It is not the people of Bombay. Nobody had consulted the people of Bombay. Nobody had consulted anybody. It was the leaders of Maharashtra, whose cause Shri C. D. Deshmukh has been championing, who did not have and did not want a city State for Bombay.

Shri S. S. More: Congress leaders and not all leaders.

Shri S. K. Patil: I am sorry that Shri S. S. More feels that he is not in the list of house leaders.

It could not be done. Even if it is to be done now, we are not against it. The majority of the citizens of Bombay is not against it. Therefore, what was really possible then, and what would have been done, if it was not done, it is for a good cause the Congress leadership and the national leadership thought that if in that process they could get the Maharashtra people with them, if they could really make them agree, it would be a fine proposition. That is why they did it and not out of any other motive.

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: May I offer a personal explanation, Sir? I stated in my statement that the suggestion about Central administration was accompanied by two very important considerations which were deliberately omitted when the announcement was made. Further, so far as I am concerned, I have said that my own choice has always been for the bigger bilingual Bombay. It is only because of conflict of leadership that I am sorry. I feel it is now too late.

An Hon. Member: Can interruption be made like this?

Shri S. K. Patil: I do not mind that.

That disposes of the argument of the City State. Then, he goes on and says that it could have been done if City State was there by a simple majority and now, by this process, perhaps a two-thirds majority was necessary. I hope to be correctly informed about it. He is wrong. I do not know where he got it from.

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: I am sorry the hon. Member misquotes me. I have to get up. I said nobody has decided this. It is quite possible that somebody might suggest since that matter is open that instead of a simple majority it might be two-thirds majority. Nobody has decided it today but the whole thing is vague.

Shri S. K. Patil: I do not think this interruption is called for. But he did say that. I am merely suggesting to him that his suspicion was not well-founded. Anybody may

[Shri S. K. Patil]

suggest anything. But today, as the matter stands and in the report of the Joint Committee that we are considering, there is no such suggestion made.

After that he drew a very sordid picture of what is happening in Bombay today; what a great danger lies in the way of Maharashtrians. So many things are happening. It is all an imaginary picture. I do not know whether he got this sitting in Delhi or in Bombay where he had been. But, I may assure him from what little I know of the city of Bombay that that picture is not only overpainted but there is no truth whatsoever in the picture. He assumes that attempts will be made by somebody or other that the Maharashtrians should go from there. But he forgets that the city of Bombay is not the place only for the Maharashtrians or the Gujeratis. It is a pure accident that Gujerat is near. If U.P. was near and if five lakhs of people of U.P. were in Bombay as they are, does he think he could have crossed swords with U.P.? It is a question of all minorities and not Gujeratis only. Does he say that the Gujeratis are doing their best to see that Maharashtrians go away from there and all the employers—and he gave all sorts of adjectives to them—are going to do this? It is really overdrawing the picture.

Shri C. D. Deshmukh *rose*—

Shri S. K. Patil: I am not yielding unless it is a point of order. The hon. Member has done this often enough. I do not want to waste the time. But, my answer is this.

I am merely saying that this picture which he gave before our eyes that it will happen that one or two lakhs of people will have to go and the majority of them Maharashtrians —it is not a majority today; It is only 44 per cent—will be reduced. He also said that 30,000 Maharashtrians will be going out of the Secretariat and other services etc. Now, Sir, when we do this, the repercussions are that somebody will have to go and somebody will have to come. This is not done with the purpose that Maharashtrians should go. I do not know where he got this figure of 30,000. He said these 30,000 people and their families will have to go and so many votes will be lost. In all humility, I would tell my hon. friend this. If we are really going to look at things in this fashion, it is the strongest case ever made against the whole scheme of reorganisation of States. It only means this; that we are going to make friends our enemies and that we are going to be deadlier enemies than we were and that we have to see that the majority is reduced to a minority. If these pictures are really conjured up, I think, the sooner we forget all our thoughts of national unity in this country the better it is. Nothing of this kind is going to happen.

Then, again, why should he imagine that this is an agitation started by money-bags. He has been dealing with the money-bags and, therefore, he knows them better. He said it has been supported by money-bags. He must remember that 95 per cent of the voters of Bombay are not money-bags; they are people who have got a right to have a democratic way of life to think for themselves. What will happen to them? What is going to be their future? Why does he imagine that this is going to be so bad as he thinks. When the Congress was fighting against the money-bags in those days—I am not talking when India was free—they were winning the elections with the support of the people; it was because the people of the city were with the Indian National Congress—and they will always be with the Congress. Why should he be afraid if really people believed in democratic principles that the votes will go against the Maharashtrians? If the Maharashtrians behave, during these five years all these suspicions that are entertained against them—may be for very good reasons—if they

behave themselves there would be no ground for this suspicion at all. There are other minorities; there are 5 lakhs of north Indians; 5 lakhs of south Indians; there are 3 lakhs of Kannadigas in the city of Bombay; and why does he think only of the Maharashtrians and Gujeratis? The Karnataka Provincial Congress Committee, by their unanimous vote, have suggested that the city of Bombay should remain an independent State or Centrally administered. If it were really left to other provinces, they would have done the same thing. The whole linguistic agitation is for getting power and when power-mania gets hold of a man, it is impossible for anybody to give in. The minorities naturally feel that if it is merely a unilingual State what will happen is that the people of that particular clan will get preference in everything. They want to remain in India in a strong secular State where their rights shall be secured and guaranteed. It is not because they have got animus against anybody. The Maharashtrians will have the lion's share of it because 44 per cent of them are there. Bombay being surrounded by Maharashtra, when it becomes a Centrally administered State, when greater confidence is restored, there will be many industries and, perhaps, out of every 10 people employed there 6 or 7 are bound to be Maharashtrians because they come from the nearest places. It all depends upon the behaviour of the leaders. If you go on agitating in a manner in which it is being done,—I do not refer to violence and hooliganism because our idea is for securing a calm consideration—I say, that if this agitational approach was not there and if things were done in a manner that the minority does feel reassured, that there is no danger in remaining with you, they could have got perhaps much quicker what they are fighting for today. As I said, the Prime Minister or the Congress High Command did the right thing because even today there is not the atmosphere to justify the inclusion of Bombay in Maharashtra. Whatever has happened has had such bad repercussions for the city of Bombay that even if you give it to Maharashtra now, immediately after all this agitation and when all the wounds have not healed, what will happen? All that sad, sordid and dark picture drawn by Shri Deshmukh will be realistic and the people will feel, 'Let us go away from this place because there is danger in living here'. What is the answer to that? It is that time should be allowed; time should be allowed to heal the wounds. And it takes a little longer time for those wounds to heal. It is not that somebody is going to run away with Bombay. Pakistan has not claimed Bombay.

My friend himself admitted that Delhi has got some reasons for being Centrally administered as being the capital. Bombay is also in the same position though it is not the capital. Do not compare it with any other city.

It is not a question of who wins in the debate. I once again appeal to my friends, let us approach this subject from a constructive angle. Even now if it were possible to forget the whole thing and come to a *status quo*, it would have been much better but it is not practicable; it is not possible. If it is possible, do it. I join with Shri Deshmukh that the best solution and the permanent solution for the city of Bombay is a bigger bilingual State. I read his speech and I think he was misquoted. In the Bombay Provincial Congress Committee we were never opposed to that. I say the people of Gujerat and the people concerned were ready for it and they accepted. In this Parliament I have again and again said that the citizens of Bombay are for a bilingual State. That was possible six months before But, circumstances have made it impossible to-day. Even among the people today tempers have been inflamed, many sad events have happened and it will take time for wounds to heal. Therefore, the Prime Minister said, give 2, 3 or 5 years—whatever the time may be—for the

[Shri S. K. Patil]

wounds to heal. Possibly the people can come together and they will come together much faster than we imagine and when the proper atmosphere is created a further solution in consultation with the people of Bombay would be possible. The Gujeratis are not even 15 per cent of the whole population; other minorities are about 40 per cent of the population. Those minorities could be persuaded and you can tell them that ultimately the good of the city lies in its going to Maharashtra. Surely it is for the Maharashtrians to do so. Without doing that, without doing anything in order to take the minorities with them, they come here and say that this is going to happen and, therefore, the city will never go to Maharashtra —not only now but at any time in the future. They should not persist in such measures of agitational approach that they are following today. If their agitational approach is left away, if they think that the city is held in trust—by whom? not by any foreign power, not by any doubtful person but by this Parliament or by the Government of India—in order that a proper atmosphere may be created in the city after some time, and there will be again an evaluation of the factors then existing, then if something can be done, it will surely be done at that time.

A lot of talk was there about surpluses. I am not interested in that because it is his province. But surely it is not for employment, it is not merely for economic considerations that a few crores of rupees can go here or there that the citizens of Bombay have been claiming that they should be allowed the freedom of choice. I am not sure what will happen at the end of five years. It all depends upon the atmosphere that will be created. Possibly the Central administration will be so nice that people might feel that there is a peculiar kind of pride to belong to the whole country and that the cosmopolitan and secular life should be maintained. Possibly they may feel that way. Or they may feel that they may go and become a part of the Government of Maharashtra which is surrounding them. Surely they may do that if they like. Let us not talk again and again here, everywhere and outside, and fanatically approach the people saying that great injustice has been done, something very wrong is done to us, because by doing so, the people, unsophisticated people, not knowing what exactly is being done here, feel perhaps that a kind of discriminatory treatment has been accorded to them. They feel so and sometimes they do things which they ought not to do.

Without taking much of your time I would appeal to Shri Deshmukh to join hands with me in bringing about a bilingual State in Bombay. That is the permanent solution good not only for Bombay, but even for Thana, Kolaba and Ratnagiri—the track known as the Konkani. My hon. friend comes from Kolaba, I know. My district is four times bigger than his although his is four times richer than mine; he is a big monied man whereas I am a poor man. The difficulty is how the Gujaratis will respond to it. Nothing is difficult. After all, you can depend upon the patriotism of the people. If you go and tell them, "let us have some sort of a regional arrangement, we are not going to be worse off by this, we have lived together for 100 years and more and if such an approach is made from now on, nothing is impossible of achievement."

Therefore, my appeal to this Parliament and all other people is this: If your ultimate aim is to have a big bilingual State, do not destroy those common instruments by which a bilingual position can be attained, namely, the common High Court, the Common Public Service Commission and many other things that are common. It may appear unpalatable to some of the people but it is good in the long run. If ultimately our goal is to bring about a bigger bilin-

gual State, that will only be possible by all the three Governments—the Government of Maharashtra, the Government of Bombay, that is the Centre, and the Government of Gujarat—having their seats of office in the city of Bombay, so that when they sit in the same secretariat, get up in the same lift and so on, they will see each other every day and will try to be friendly. Even if they are going to cook separately, let there be one kitchen for them, and then after a time they themselves will get tired of cooking separately and will become one. This is the 'give and take' attitude, and that is the attitude which fosters national unity in the country. Heavens are not going to fall if we do not immediately waste money in building capitals in Poona and Ahmedabad costing a few crores of rupees. Once this money is spent reunion may become more difficult. We spent money for a capital at Kurnool and now we are getting Hyderabad where the capital of Andhra will move. Why waste crores and crores of rupees in this wasteful manner? The natural solution and the permanent solution which will help everyone is to have a bilingual State and I know that State will be an ideal State.

If such an atmosphere is to be created, it could be created but not by the type of attitude that we are at present exhibiting here. Such an atmosphere can be created by good people, able people, influential people like Shri Deshmukh going to the people and telling them what is good for them. I am sure in that way we will achieve our goal, if not in two years a little later. We must all lend our energies in that direction. That is the permanent solution to the problem. If Bombay goes to Maharashtra just now in this agitation, it is disastrous to Maharashtra. Even if it remains as it is, it may be disastrous too because in the present condition there will be no peace either in Bombay or Maharashtra. They do not know what type of Government will be in Maharashtra.

Let us put our State on the wheels of peace, prosperity and unity for the larger good of the country so that Bombay should remain a prosperous city so that a good and progressive State may not be destroyed by these bickerings and disruptive tendencies. From now on if we try in that manner, if not immediately at least after some time we shall bring about a bilingual bigger State, which shall be the eternal glory not only of Maharashtra but of the whole country.

Shri Jaipal Singh: I want your directions on this point. It has been stated by Shri A. M. Thomas that the statement of the Prime Minister was circulated to the Members of the Joint Committee. I was a Member of the Joint Committee, but I certainly do not remember seeing it. A wrong impression has been created here as though the statement was circulated to us.

Shri A. M. Thomas: I never said it was circulated. I must point out that Shri Deogirikar read out the full statement for the Joint Committee.

Mr. Speaker: Even when the Joint Committee was sitting here, this matter was brought to my notice—I was on tour at that time—stating that they wanted to make a reference to the Prime Minister's statement, and I permitted it. The hon. Prime Minister was not here, he was abroad and it took some time to get the extract. Now it has been circulated to Members.

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: If you will permit me to say a word....

Mr. Speaker: I think enough has been said.

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: I am not adding any arguments. The hon. Member said that I referred to Gujaratis in Bombay. I have never done so and if he will read through the transcript of my speech....

Mr. Speaker: He took "money bags" for the Gujaratis.

Mr. Speaker: At every stage if you go on correcting, there is no end to it. The hon. Member says something and draws a picture and it is for others to say what the picture is like. Shri Patil thinks that money bags referred to Gujaratis.

Sardar Hukam Singh (Kapurthala-Bhatinda): It is very difficult for me, after these two important speeches, to get as much attention of the Members of the House as I should have expected otherwise. After these two speeches I feel diffident whether I shall be able to attract the attention of hon. Members which I would have expected otherwise.

I did not have very great intention of participating in this debate, but day before yesterday, my sister here, Shrimati Renu Chakravartty, asked me why it is that we had not been able to understand the real problem of Punjab.

That is correct. The case of Bombay has been put forward so elaborately and beautifully by both sides that hon. Members can understand it very well. There was a complaint from one hon. Member, who was sitting to my left. His complaint was that, as yet, most of the Members had not been able to appreciate what this Punjab problem was. My complaint is that this difficulty arises because of the fact that in some quarters, attemps are made to confuse and confound issues which were very clear. What is the Punjab problem? It can be known very easily and stated very briefly. But, when some confusion is created deliberately, it becomes a little difficult to have a clear understanding of the problem.

How did others understand that problem? I shall put that first. My friend, Shri Asoka Mehta, has in this very debate said:

> "....I felt, at long last, there was a solution which could become the basis ultimately of reconciling the two great communities in that State, but instead, the formula is being taken by one set of people to begin with, and we now find by more people, and more and more it is used as a first step towards reopening the whole controversy."

What does it mean? He goes further:

> "..It is amazing to find that while a great minority community is sought to be integrated, another great community, the majority community, is not prepared even in a region to accept the position of a minority. How are we ever going to integrate a minority in the body politic of our country, if everywhere, in every condition, in every position, in every State, in every circumstance, the majority community insists upon being in a majority?"

My submission is that this is the whole crux of the problem. I entirely agree with Shri Asoka Mehta and I give him this credit that he has understood it quite rightly and described it so succinctly.

Another hon. Member has also referred to it. Shri Anandchand said:

> "Now, as far as I have been able to see, most of the agitation that has been launched by the Maha Punjab Samiti and otherwise against the regional formula has been based on their apprehension that in due course of time perhaps this formula will have laid the foundation of a Punjabi *Suba* or a separate Sikh. State. That apprehension might be coming into their minds because of the Sikh population of the Punjabi-speaking areas, as now demarcated, in the districts of.... The total population of these Punjabi-speaking areas.... comes to about 91 lakhs and in this the Sikh population accidentally would be more than 52 lakhs. If that is the question, the apprehension might be there that probably in the carving out of these Punjabi-speaking areas, if the Sikh population is over 56 or 57

per cent in the Punjabi zone, the Hindus in that region will be relegated to a subordinate position. Therefore, they have this fear and apprehension expressed in various forms."

He is correct. It so happens that Sikhs are so placed in Punjab that, if these linguistic and cultural principles are adhered to—the principles according to which the map of India has been re-drawn—there is a viable unit that would have been formed here but the Sikhs would have been in a majority. That was exactly what could not be tolerated. We never wanted that a State should be formed where the Sikhs should become a majority. We only wanted that the same principles which are applied elsewhere should be applied here also and whatever the proportion of any community, it should be suffered and tolerated. We only desired that the same principles should be adhered to. That has not been done.

I may make it clear just at the beginning that I am not standing here for re-opening of the old controversy. I am not asking for Punjabi *Suba*. I am only explaining the position as it is at present. Schedule VIII of the Constitution says that Punjabi is one of the regional languages of India. It must have a region, then. In that region, Punjabi should have the same status as any of the regional languages has in its own region. That is the whole problem. We only wanted to know if Punjabi was not a language. If it is not a language, let Parliament scrap that. Let it be decided today that Punjabi is no language and then the Sikhs shall understand what their position is.

Shri Nand Lal Sharma (Sikar): Why Sikhs alone?

Sardar Hukam Singh: Because, the Hindus disown their mother-tongue and say that it is the Sikh's language. The advocates of Ram Rajya Parishad are in the forefront in this.

Shri Nand Lal Sharma: I am sorry as this is a wrong interpretation.

Sardar Hukam Singh: I can quote from his speech and from the speeches of other representatives that they have disowned this language. They say that it is not their mother tongue and they have advised their co-religionists to disown that. But, I have made it clear that I am not here asking for Punjabi *Suba* but I am only telling what the trouble is.

Punjabi is a language and it is entered in the 8th Schedule of our Constitution. What is the region where it is spoken? If I may repeat what I said before, people wanted that Punjabi should have a regional status. That is not to be given. There was a demand in the country that it should be divided on linguistic basis. After Partition, it gathered momentum. Are we to blame for that? Our leaders had been giving the assurance that the country would be divided after independence. Freedom came. This was the first thing promised to be done after freedom. There was a demand that India should be divided on linguistic basis. Punjabi was one of the languages in the Constitution and if North India was to be divided there must have been Punjabi *Suba* for the Punjabi region.

We saw that there was some exploitation, we were not getting equal protection, we felt that we were not treated well. Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava had many facts to give. He was bemoaning the treatment that Hariana got. He complained that that tract had been exploited by other Punjabis. He feared that this might continue unless something was done. I am at one with him. I agree with him that this has been done. That is my complaint as well....

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava (Gurgaon): No. Wherever there is any linguistic minority, it should be amply and adequately protected.

Sardar Hukam Singh: That is an act and we agree there.

He says that Hariana people had been exploited. My submission is that

(Sardar Hukam Singh)

we have also been exploited. We wanted—as Hariana people wanted—an escape from that. The reorganisation gave us a ray of hope. If this part is also reorganised on the same principle, language, culture, etc. then, certainly Hariana also gets some freedom from that exploitation.

We also become equal partners. That was the only question. But that could not be tolerated because, as I have said, we were so placed that if these principles were applied, then we would become a majority of 57 per cent. As Shri Asoka Mehta has said, it is a tragedy that the majority community is not prepared to suffer. Then the minority community might become a majority even in one corner of the country; that is the whole trouble. When we made this demand then certainly they got nervous and said: "Oh! The Sikhs want a State. They are thinking of becoming independent." No such idea ever occurred to us and we only wanted the re-distribution of the States on language basis.

When that demand of ours was defeated, when that demand was rejected, nobody realised what our feelings were. Punjabi language was denied the status that any regional language had. Even its own sons had disowned it and they had said that it is not a language and that it is only a dialect. They lost their battle in the first instance when the Constitution was adopted. Then the attack began on the script that Gurmukhi is no script. Now, they say,—we have heard that from many hon. Members here also, I do not want to name them—and they swear by the Sikh Gurus and argue that the Sikhs have monopolised the Sikh Gurus. Who says that? Who can monopolise that? I wish my brethren had acknowledged them as their Gurus as well. Then there would have been no trouble. Here it has been argued 'Punjabi is our language, we love it, we revere it, we respect, but if we do not want to learn it then who can impose it on us?' It is a language of the Gurus. It is all very well. We have every reverence for it, but if we do not want to learn it why should it be imposed on us? That is a very beautiful argument. Would it be partriotic for a Bengali to come up and say that Bengali language is imposed on him, for a Tamilian to come up and say that Tamil has been imposed on him or a Telugu to come up and say that Telugu language has been imposed on him. It can be understood that in Hariana, where Hindi is the mother tongue, that is being imposed because that is not their language. But for a Punjabi to think that the language is imposed upon him is wrong. Who imposes it? The simple question was that in a particular sphere it was the regional language and it was to have the status of a regional language. If somebody does not want to read it, let him not. He can do whatever he likes. But, because that regional status was to be denied to that language certain devices were found out, certain limitations were placed and certain formula was evolved, and because they were made-up, concocted things which were not natural, certain things had to be done, sometimes to appease the Sikhs and sometimes to appease the Hindus. If they were taking away the regional status of Punjabi language, then they had to do something. Even in Hariana—my friend Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava made a legitimate complaint—why should the people read Punjabi? Why did we want that it should be imposed on them? I also want that they should not read it, but what is the alternative? The Punjabi-speaking areas will have to be separated where there should be Punjabi and the Hindi-speaking areas will have to be separated where there should be Hindi. That is the only alternative. But they would not accept that alternative and they opposed it. When the complications arose because of an unnatural union then they asked why the language should be imposed on them. You should have one thing, whatever you may like.

Have natural division, or if you want to come together then some adjustments shall have to be made. Choose either of the two, whichever you like, but something has to be tolerated.

When this was the attitude and the Punjabi was being disowned, the certainly there was some nervousness among the Sikhs. They were isolated. A majority of my brethren —I do not say that all of them did— were denying and disowning the language. The Sikhs were naturally isolated and when they were isolated they had to stand alone and demand that a Punjabi *Suba* has to be formed or Punjabi language should be given that protection. Then they were called names—isolationists, separatists, they have got some alliances with Pakistan and so on. All sorts of things were attributed to them.

Then the S.R.C. Commission gave their verdict and they rejected the demand for a Punjabi *Suba*. What was done? They should have realised how we suffered. The demand for Punjabi *Suba* was rejected in which the Sikhs would have been 57 per cent in a majority. Now, whatever we might say, whatever reasons we might advance, the truth is that the country has been divided on a linguistic basis. There have been two instances—Bombay and Punjab. I am sure—from the debates here I can very well say that—Bombay is going to Maharashtra today, tomorrow or the day after. It is going and then Punjab would be the only exception. That would not be, according to the principles that have been laid down for the whole country. And, where is the difference? The only difference is that the Sikhs are living in this area.

The Punjabi *Suba* in which we would have had a majority of 57 per cent was rejected. Then PEPSU was eliminated, where the Sikhs were, though not an absolute majority, in a single majority of 49.5 per cent. If that was to be retained then other arguments could have been harnessed, but that was taken away. Sir, the feelings of the Sikhs should be realised and appreciated. They were not allowed to have a clear majority in one State and they were deprived of a majority in another State. Both things happened simultaneously. Then there was a third thing. Punjabi was not given even the regional status. All these three things we have suffered.

Then the Indian leaders sat together and evolved a formula, which has been attacked by so many Members here, the regional formula. I am glad to acknowledge that the speeches this time have been rather temperate and were not so severe as they were last time, and that is a happy event. It has even been argued that it is wrong to believe that this regional formula satisfies the country and that the majority of the people are against it. This impression has been given to the Members here. But what is this formula? If it does not even satisfy the majority of people —the great community of Hindus, our elders, who are in a majority in Punjab—why should we enforce it? Certainly that question arises. But I would like to tell those critics that this arrangement, which is now proposed, satisfies, out of 170 lakhs of people the S.R.C. had recommended to unite— Himachal Pradesh, Punjab and PEPSU —11 lakhs belonging to Himachal Pradesh, 55 lakhs or thereabout belonging to Hariana—for whom my friend Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava spoke so much about—and 52 lakhs of Sikhs.

Ch. Ranbir Singh (Rohtak): 10 lakhs Kangra people also.

Sardar Hukam Singh: That is good. So, it satisfies another 10 lakhs. That means it satisfies 130 lakhs of people out of 170 lakhs. Now there are 40 lakhs of people who are arrayed against these 130 lakhs of people. They say they would not allow the formula to be introduced. There is so much of furore and noise made.

These 40 lakhs of people are the people who have been exploiting the

(Sardar Hukam Singh)

backward people. They are the people who have been getting all the benefit. Most of them were urban people who had the advantage of being in power. They had been utilising that power. It was represented by them to the Hariana people that the Sikhs are disloyal, that they want to go away to Pakistan and that the others must unite together lest the Sikhs should disintegrate the country, because they are the enemies of the country.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: Nobody in Hariana ever said that the Sikhs are siding with Pakistan. They never said so earlier nor do they say so now. Nobody in Hariana ever said that Sardar Hukam Singh or Master Tara Singh are disloyal to the country. It is wrong to say that.

Sardar Hukam Singh: I am constrained to bring to the notice of the hon. Member one example. I do not know whether I should name the gentleman. Well, Sondhi went round and....

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: Mr. Sondhi did not belong to Hariana at all.

Sardar Hukam Singh: When Mr. Sondhi's constituency was not formed as he desired, he circulated and propagated that the Sikh State was sure to be formed and that the Sikhs would go over to Pakistan, separate from India, and my friend Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava was one of the three Members who went to the President for rectification.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: Not for this purpose. Mr. Sondhi never said to the President that Sikhs would go to Pakistan and we never supported any such thesis which is now mentioned by the hon. Member. We only mentioned that nobody should tamper with delimitation proposals on extraneous and improper grounds.

Sardar Hukam Singh: One Deputy Minister here, who is now in the Cabinet, told me so. I can confront this issue. This appeared in *Pratap*. I can reproduce the cutting which says that my hon. friend met the President in this connection. Subsequently, I went to the President and said that if this is going to be the fate of the minority, where will they be in the future.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: The issue was quite different.

Sardar Hukam Singh: That is what I gathered from the President. That was the issue.

Shri U. M. Trivedi (Chittor): Both are correct and both are wrong!

Sardar Hukam Singh: That was the impression which I got and I approached the President subsequently. The next day the *Tribune* published in banner headlines that three hon. Members had approached the President for this purpose. It was published in the *Tribune* the next day. I carried that cutting to the President subsequently. Anyhow, Hariana people may not have said that, but others might have said that.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: Nobody in Hariana ever said that Master Tara Singh and Sardar Hukam Singh would go to Pakistan or side with Pakistan against India. It is entirely wrong.

Sardar Hukam Singh: I have sent the cutting to the Prime Minister.

Lala Achint Ram: It was said so in certain quarters. The hon. Member, Sardar Hukam Singh is right in saying that observations were made.

Sardar Hukam Singh: Yes; I am not blaming any Member. It was said so in certain quarters.

Well, I was referring to what Ch. Ranbir Singh said, namely, that ten lakhs more would be the total, making the number to work up to 40 lakhs. They were asserting that it is their right and that they are determined not to allow this thing to continue. I appeal to them and to the Members of Parliament here: if there is some relief given to the minority so that they may

be saved from exploitation, is it unfair? If such a relief is given to Hariana people also, certainly, they would be glad of it. Though my friend Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava differs on this point—he says that they are glad that they have got it but that ultimately they would be disillusioned and perhaps they may not get adequate protection or something like that—I might say that they have got certain relief and they are glad of it. If the minority feels frustrated that the same principles have not been applied to their case, and that if they had been applied they would have got a majority area in this union, when they feel that they have been deprived of the only corner where they had a majority, namely, in PEPSU, when they feel that even now their language is the one language which has not been given the adequate status that any other regional language has got in this country, if they feel that this partial arrangement of making a zone wherein certain subjects could be discussed by sitting close to their Hindu brethren, is it too much to expect from my elder Hindu brethren that they should show us some spirit of accommodation? What has been done is very clear to this country. Everybody knows how things have been proceeding Every countryman feels nervous about what is happening in Punjab and I feel it most.

We have been told that this regional formula is just a communal division of the Punjab. That the learned advocate of the Hindu Mahasabha, our greatest advocate of the Supreme Court, expressed the view that it was worse than the communal award. Is this the guidance to be given to our Hindu brethren by such an eminent advocate and eminent leaders? He said that this is worse than the communal award. This is the guidance that he has given. He has made a speech about it elsewhere and also in this House, he has repeated it that this division is on communal lines. What happens to that formula is a different thing, and we shall have to see. He has said that there will be only one Cabinet, one legislature and one Governor. He referred to the subjects which will come within the powers of the regional committees, namely, public health, sanitation, primary and secondary education—university is not included—agriculture—but not the other allied subjects—cottage and small-scale industries, preservation and protection and improvement of live-stock, pounds and prevention of cattle trespass, protection of wild animals, fisheries—we have none in Punjab—inns and innkeepers, markets and fairs, co-operative societies, charities and charitable institutions, local self-government and development and economic progress. What would happen? The committee would sit together and discuss. They say it is a division on communal lines—Hindus and Sikhs. Probably the members would be equal in numbers. Even if one section happens to be 57 per cent, is it so offensive to my friends if they look to the protection of, say, wild animals? Cannot they bear and tolerate such co-operation? At least at some stage, they might sit together, look as equal and feel as equal.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: They have a common Legislative Assembly where they sit together.

Sardar Hukam Singh: Is it because, in that case, one section would be 70 per cent and the other would be 30 per cent. that such regional committees are not liked? This has been clearly enunciated by Shri Asoka Mehta and Shri Anandchand. Gurgaon was being mentioned. There was a fear that Gurgaon might be taken away. It was said that it was the dream for a Sikh State to exclude Gurgaon, so that they might become 31 per cent. We said that Gurgaon might be taken out because there was no direct communication between Punjab and Gurgaon. Everyone has to pass through Delhi, by spending one night at Delhi, for going to Punjab from Gurgaon. But it was said that not one inch of land would be given. That old mentality was there. But what is going to happen, I do not know.

[Sardar Hukam Singh]

They said that not one inch of land could be given, because they must have that 70 per cent.

My friend Shri U. M. Trivedi pointed out that they will sit together in the Legislative Assembly. So, what is the division between the Hindus and the Sikhs? Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava took half an hour to say what is happening now. After all, they are all Hindu brethren. Further, the Hariana people gained in this, more than the Sikhs. It is not the Sikhs who gained here. Are not the Hariana people Hindus? Or, do they belong to any other religion?

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: If they have treated us like this, then the doubt arises as to whether we are really Hindus! They have ignored tyranny over us.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: Unfortunately, the Hariana people speak *gandhi* language called Hindi. That is why they are treated like that. If they speak Punjabi they will be treated all right.

Sardar Hukam Singh: Perhaps, they could settle their disputes separately! My complaint is this. What I am complaining of is that even this is not tolerated and it is advertised that this is worse than the Communal award. If this is worse than the Communal Award I wonder what the hon. leader of the Hindu Mahasabha wants.

2 P.M.

When Mr. Chatterjee was speaking on the Bihar and West Bengal (Transfer of Territories) Bill the other day, he was interrupted by an hon. Member: "What about Maha Punjab?" Mr. Chatterjee replied: "That is a different thing, because there the question of security comes; that is a border State." It is very curious that Bengal, according to him, is not a border State; there is no danger of infiltration. Now just see the consistency of our great leader, Mr. N. C. Chatterjee. For the border state of West Bengal he makes an exception; Punjab he says admits of infiltration. I ask him Does Bengal not admit of any infiltration?

He is very zealous of linguistic States. Read the whole speech. He is a staunch supporter of the linguistic principle; but an exception should be made in the case of Punjab. This is his attitude. He wants bigger States on the border, but Bengal should be an exception.

An Hon. Member: It is his native place.

Sardar Hukam Singh: Mr. Chatterjee says that he agrees with the States Reorganisation Commission. What a beautiful agreement—that on the border there ought to be bigger states, because initially though the Centre has the responsibility, certainly the first brunt has to be borne by the States. These are the reasons given in the S.R.C. Report and he has repeated them. If that is the reason, why do you oppose the merger of Bihar and Bengal?

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: The people of Bengal opposed it.

Sardar Hukam Singh: No. In a press statement he made, Mr. Chatterjee said that it would swamp the Bengalis. If Bengal and Bihar are united, it would swamp away the Bengali race!

Shri B. S. Murthy (Eluru): Who said it?

Sardar Hukam Singh: Mr. N. C. Chatterjee. When it comes to a question of Bihar and Bengal, he opposes it on the ground that the Bengalis would be swamped away and that they will be in a minority. Here he asks: Why is Himachal Pradesh not brought in? He has no consideration for others. He is a supporter of linguistic principle; but here they are ignored. He is a supporter of bigger States, but then he would not have it in his own State. These are things that are propagated here by responsible persons.

I do not wish to take a very long time, because on all these questions we have spoken already and given our grounds. As I have made it clear I am not arguing here for the demand of a Punjabi-speaking State. I have given my agreement and I am satisfied with that. I am prepared to accept that and act on that. I say that this regional formula should be acted upon, at least in some spheres however small they may be. We have got a place where we will sit together and feel that we are close to each other. Perhaps, that might train us to work in bigger fields.

Now it was said by Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava that he had no other objection. He said that at least people who could agree should sit together and if they could evolve an agreement, certainly he would have no objection. I must in this connection remind him that on the 10th of April I made a statement at Ludhiana that if this formula were injurious to our Hindu brethern, they should come and sit with me and convince me, in which case I would be prepared to forego these provisions, if it endangered them. I ask my hon. friends here as well as outside whether there was one Hindu member, a responsible member of that community who responded to that call of mine that we should sit together, whether there was one responsible Hindu member who might have said: yes, this is a good proposal, we are prepared to try it. The fact is that they believed in their own strength of power and thought that they could over-awe others and get what they wanted. They did not listen to my request. Then what happened aferwards. Certainly Master Tara Singh had to say that in the circumstances prevailing then, in view of what had happened, it was no good sitting together, when we had such strained relations.

There is one other matter to which Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava referred. On that very evening when I was in Ludhiana an announcement was made that there would be a conference for Hindu-Sikh unity and I would address it. Immediately after that another announcement came that they would not permit this meeting to be held in Ludhiana, and I had to abandon it saying that the unity of Hindus and Sikhs could not be brought about by *dhandas* and *lathis*. Because I was not permitted to hold that meeting, I had to give it up. That is a matter of common knowledge, which everybody knows.

I do not wish to go into further details. My only regret is this: this is the mentality that prevails; even in this small sphere our brethren are not prepared to give us equal treatment. We do not want superior treatment. Mr. Anandchand referred that the arrangement of boundaries can be made in such a way that the majority community remains a majority community. The same idea is there; otherwise perhaps the trouble might not be there. That was what we knew and why we had submitted certain proposals to the S. R. C. They also put that question. They said that such and such an area is not Punjabi speaking. I said: then take it out. They said that we would then become a majority. I replied; if that is our fault, if acting on the principles we become a majority, then reduce us to a minority by some means. We are prepared to submit to that. What else can we say?

Shri U. M. Trivedi: Why count yourself separate?

Sardar Hukam Singh: I must request you to give me two more minutes to answer this interruption.

We say that we are one. We speak the same language; we live in the same land. The other section says: no, you are not. Before Partition we had been saying that we were a separate community. This is correct, I maintain that even now. But then our brethren said that this was because of the British who wanted to separate us. The first thing that they should have done after Partition was that they should have implemented their intentions and their professions.

[Sardar Hukam Singh]

But the very first thing that was done was the passing of the Constitution and the President's Scheduled Castes Order, by which we were separated, whether by agreement or otherwise that is a different thing. That was done so that the Sikhs cannot enjoy these privileges.

Leave that aside. We say that we speak the same language. They say: no, this is the Sikh language, that is not our language; we are not prepared to agree to that. We say that Gurumukhi script is the natural script for Punjabi. The Vice-President of the Hindu Mahasabha said: no, that is the Sikh script, that will have an impression on our children. Our children will be impressed by the Sikh culture; we are not prepared for that. We say we are one. They say, you are not; you are separate. We are being goaded, separated, and segregated. We are then offered certain safeguards. It is an attempt that we might be reduced to a linguistic minority by disowning that language. We are not a linguistic minority. But an attempt is being made in that direction. I may in this connection refer to a resolution of the Muslim League as well. It was on these three things that Mr. Jinnah enunciated his theory of two nations: separate religion, separate language, separate culture, separate way of living. We say we are one. Our brethren, especially this advocate of Jan Sangh, says: you are separate, you have a separate language; you have a separate religion; you have a separate culture.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: I am very sorry, —I speak subject to correction —I never said it, I never meant it. Even today I say that you are one. Even in my day before yesterday's speech I said that to me there is absolutely no difference between a Sikh and a Hindu, between a Jain and a Hindu, and I say that you Sikhs are Hindus first and Hindus last. I never make any differentiation between a Sikh and a Hindu. I know you have got a Hindu brother and the only difference is that you will be buried and that he will be cremated.

Sardar Hukam Singh: No consolation after cremation. We have to fight during our life-time. After death I will be buried and he may be cremated. The point is, they swear by the Gurus, they have reverence for the language, they have every respect for it. But, they only say we do not want it.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member has already referred to all that.

Sardar Hukam Singh: I have done, Sir.

Shri V. V. Giri (Pathapatnam): Mr. Speaker, after the warlike speeches that I have heard this morning, I am sure....

Shri A. K. Gopalan: Before you leave the Chair, Sir, may I remind you of what has been said about the extension of time? So many Members are anxious to speak.

Mr. Speaker: I shall be going on calling. Let us see how the situation develops. If I find sufficient number of Members anxious to speak, naturally it will go on.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: All right, Sir.

Shri V. V. Giri: Mr. Speaker, after the warlike speeches that have been made this morning....

Some Hon. Members: The hon. Member is not heard. He may come forward.

Shri V. V. Giri: I am quite happy here. I shall be heard.

Some Hon. Members: We can't hear you.

An Hon. Member: People want to see you seated there.

An Hon. Member: That is your proper place.

Shri V. V. Giri: I would again repeat. After the warlike speeches that have been made this morning, the peaceful utterances of mine may fall on deaf ears.

An Hon. Member: No.

Shri V. V. Giri: I must confess that I have heard with great attention and respect to the utterances of my hon. friends. I feel pained, however, because they seethe with a feeling of bitterness, a spirit that was not taught to us by our Master, Mahatma Gandhi. They must also understand that these very friends who are now opposing have fought shoulder to shoulder and sacrificed their all for securing Swaraj for our country. I would, therefore, like to emphasise here that the unity of India should be preserved at all costs and that should be given the first priority whatever the sacrifices be. To whatever part of India we may belong, in whichever part we may live, to whatever caste, creed or colour we may belong, everyone of us must feel that we are 'Indians first and Indians last, and Indians always' before we claim to belong to a particular State. Thanks to the lead given by our Prime Minister, today we are high up in the map of the world in the international sense. We hold a pride of place in the comity of nations. We have got not only to enhance and improve that position, but also be united and so organise ourselves that we secure for the common man fundamental rights which will ensure happiness and contentment. Without these fundamental rights being conceded, if we merely begin to quarrel over small matters, I do not know where this country will be led to, and mere talk of these fundamental rights guaranteed by our Constitution will be merely moonshine. Therefore, it is very necessary at the present moment, when the world is looking at us as to how we shall solve this big problem that we are discussing, we must be careful to see that we arrive at conclusions that would enhance the prestige and peace and order in this country. My fear is that the reorganisation of States is leading us to disorganisation, disintegrity and disunity. Unless we take time by the forelock, take the bull by the horns and try to come to conclusions over the many issues that have arisen and which have resulted in bitterness, the future of this country is gloomy.

That is one of the reasons why I firmly believe that from the zonal councils, we should think in terms of zonal states, and from zonal states we should think in terms of the unity, so that everybody in this country may not begin to fight for this territory or that, but feels that he stands for every inch of the country and claims every inch of the country as his. When a unitary State is established, these provincial and linguistic bickerings will not continue for long. This aspect must be before us. If, therefore, the Government can take courage in both hands and say that the future policy of this Government is not for disunity and division, but to secure unity through the zonal councils, zonal states and a unitary State. It would be better for all concerned. If that is understood by the people of this country once for all, many of these quarrels will cease. Especially, the case of Bombay has loomed large. Unless this matter is settled in a proper manner, the unity of India may be affected. Its results may be as bad as the previous 'partition of Bengal'. I would therefore, humbly suggest that Gujaratis and Maharashtrians should take courage in both hands, forget the interlude, forget the bitterness, sit across the common table and come to an understanding. The Gujeratis must remember that they have given to the world a world personage, Mahatma Gandhi. The Maharashtrians must remember that they have given a great personage, Lokmanya Tilak a leader to us who was responsible for laying the foundation for Swaraj, who said: "Swaraj is my birthright and I shall have it." These two communities can lead the whole nation. These two great leaders, though in heaven, are looking at both the communities and are feeling a bit ashamed that these two great communities are fighting amongst themselves. I, therefore, think that instead of thinking in terms of disunion and division, let us first begin

[Shri V. V. Giri]

with integration rather than disintegration. Let both the communities take courage in both hands, and say: "It does not matter. Let us try integration in the first instance, and if it fails, think of separation." I would, therefore, appeal to the two communities to set things right. It may be late, but as a trade unionist I always feel to the very last moment, till a man is dead, that he is still alive. Therefore, I would appeal to these two communities to sit together, and I almost feel that some leaders may be put in a room, locked and then asked to come to terms. On an occasion like this when the very existence of our nation is at stake, let them sit together and decide. Nothing will be lost. It is a matter of trial and error. Let them sit together and come to the conclusion that we shall have a bilingual State, with Bombay State as it is, with Saurashtra on the one side and Vidarbha on the other. Let them try it for five years. In between if they feel there are difficulties, then they can think of separation. I do feel that if Madhya Pradesh and Uttar Pradesh can succeed in having such big States, the Maharashtrians and Gujaratis can also equally succeed and give a lead to the country. If the Gujaratis with their shrewdness and the Maharashtrians with their patriotism and intelligence can give a lead in the matter of a bi-lingual State, five years later we shall certainly have a Dakshina Prdesh, we shall have another Pradesh consisting of Bihar, Bengal, Orissa and Assam, and then the ideal of zonal States will come into being, and then later we can have a unitary State.

I would appeal in the name of the unity of this country. in the name of those two great leaders who are an asset to the world and not only to India, to both Maharashtrians and Gujaratis to remember that they are put on their good behaviour. This is the time when they must sink these little differences, when they must forget bitterness, when they should forget the interlude of the last few months and come to the right conclusion and give a lead to the country.

Let us try to solve the problem by the easier method rather than by the method of dividing Bombay State into three parts practically—Bombay centrally administered, Maharashtra and Gujarat. Instead of that, let us take the easier path of having a bi-lingual State. Parliament will be watching with attention and respect the lead that they are giving. And if they feel honestly that it is not correct, certainly then we can consider whether Bombay should be centrally administered, whether it should be a City State or whether it should be kept in Maharashtra. As one who has some experience and who is a trade unionist who believes always in compromises and settlements, I do beg of Maharashtrians and Gujaratis to go into this matter as brothers. We belonging to the other parts of the country are with you. I do feel that if an impartial vote is taken today in this House, everybody will say as I am saying. *viz.*, "Let us give a chance for the bi-lingual State to be there for some time, and then we shall see in an honest and genuine manner if we have to resort to some other solution."

I would like to appeal to the Prime Minister, my hon. friend the Home Minister and others not to think merely that the Joint Committee has come to this conclusion and so we have finished with it, our minds are closed, but let them make an effort once again. sit with a few leaders of Maharashtra and Gujarat sit in a room and come to conclusions. I am sure they will agree with the view that I am expressing now.

I have said that I have always believed in a unitary State, and if that can be done today I have no quarrel, but if the unitary State can come only after the zonal States, some of these little things have to be looked

into by the Government and I do believe that a statutory boundary commission should be established to settle little maters of boundary disputes between the different new States. And this should be done provided that the Pradesh Congress Committees or the States do not come to conclusions. I also congratulate the hon. Home Minister and the Joint Committee on feeling that a Commissioner may be appointed in the border areas. Let that be also statutory. But these are little matters. If only our Government can come to the conclusion that gradually there will be zonal States, many of the ills we are suffering from we will get over.

I make an appeal once again in all earnestness and sincerity, as one who has done 35 years of service for the country, who has always stood for the unity of India, to my Maharashtrian friends and my Gujarat friends to rise to the occasion and settle matters. I say to them: "Awake, arise, or be for ever fallen".

The Minister of Legal Affairs (Shri Pataskar): I would, first of all, make it clear that I am speaking here today as a Member of this House.

Babu Ramnarayan Singh (Hazaribagh West: Not as a Minister.

Shri Pataskar: And I would like people to try to understand the problem of Maharashtra. It is really unfortunate that there has been such an enormous debate and up till now we are groping for a solution. Even Shri S. K. Patil, the protagonist of antilinguism as he calls himself, still feels that the present decision is not the right thing and his aim is something else. Even Shri C. D. Deshmukh whom we seem to oppose stood also for a similar thing. That means there are Members in this House who are trying to find a solution of the probelm as if it was either a problem of geography or of history or of something else without regard to the question of human relations and some history which has gathered round about this question.

"After all, what is the idea of having a Maharashtra State? Does it mean that Bombay certainly belongs to Maharashtra? Does it belong to Maharashtrians? Why proceed on this basis? Any person, whether he comes from U.P., Madhya Pradesh or the South, can come and reside anywhere he likes. It is not a question, therefore, whether Bombay belongs to Maharashtra. But it does belong to Maharashtra. That is the real claim. I fail to undertand why people should be afraid of it, and therein comes the importance of geography.

After all, when we are going to form administrative units, let us not introduce any heat into the matter. It is natural that you cannot put into Maharashtra some territory from Kashmir, from U.P. or from Tamil Nad. It must be somewhere near there where you form a lingual or a bi-lingual State. Therefore, it is a natural thing that we must try to do and it is from that point of view that I believe the question is not being properly taken into consideration at all. Look at our Constitution. When we form these units, everybody will have the right to go and reside anywhere and practise a profession anywhere he likes. Therefore, the correct approach to the question is that if we say that Bombay belongs to Maharashtra, it is part of Maharashtra, it does not mean that it belongs to Maharashtrians and all the other people should be sent out, that they should go away. That is the wrong approach to the question. It is not now that I am saying this. As people are aware, I was an Associate-Member of the Dar Commission and even then I stated this, that this question has raised jealousies and passions on grounds which have nothing to do with the proper settlement of this question.

I know what this Bombay State was because I was elected to the old Bombay Legislative Council in 1927. It was not merely uni-lingual or bi-lingual, it was a four-lingual State.

Shri Tulsidas: Five.

Shri Patasikar: We had an ample dose of it, an overdose of it. People in Uttar Pradesh who have been enjoying a uni-lingual State can never understand what the sufferings were under a four-lingual State. Leave aside anything else. There were people from Sind. There were people from Gujarat. There were people from Maharashtra, and there were also people from Karnataka. Then, it was a very easy thing for the foreign administration to carry on its work in that Assembly. I was a witness to it, as the secretary of the Opposition Party; in those days, I used to sit there, where my hon. friends in the Opposition are now sitting. So, I know what this means. It is not merely a theoretical question. As I said, Maharashtrians had, from the very beginning, an over-dose of anti-linguism or whatever else you may call it. In fact, we had four-linguism.

Fortunately for us, in 1935, the Sindhis went away. If you look at the problem in the proper perspective, you will find that it is only for administrative convenience that we are doing it now, and as I said, every other person in the whole of the country has got a right to reside there and do whatever he likes. Now, after all, who is a Maharashtrian? Anybody who might have come there some two hundreds years ago, and anybody who might come there tomorrow will be a Maharashtrian, because he is a resident of that State. The word has no further significance than that.

But this four-linguistic character of that State has perverted the minds of many of the persons. I know what the bloc from Sind did. But I do not want to repeat that story now. After the Sindhis went away, we were three. Out of that population, 53 per cent. were Maharashtrians, and the rest, namely 47 per cent., were Karnatakas and Gujaratis. It was a very balanced State, something of which some people seem to be fond, or at any rate, at least the States Reorganisation Commission were fond. I know it is that which is responsible for this feeling of separatism between the different language groups, because that was the source of jealousy and internecine quarrels and unholy combinations between different groups.

That is the history of this question. You must have the psychological approach towards this matter, and then you can find a very easy solution. If you think as if the whole problem has arisen today, and you have to decide it, on some theoretical basis, then I am very sorry it will be very difficult to arrive at any agreed decision. Now, what is happening here? In spite of all this debate, nobody seems to be in a proper mood to consider what is really to be done about this business. That is the difficulty in the matter.

When this question started in 1947, I was a member of the Constituent Assembly (Legislative), and it was my resolution which had got precedence on 27th November 1947. Was it conceived in the spirit of linguism? No. I think, you, Sir, were also there at that time. The resolution was couched in the following terms:

> "This Assembly is of opinion that steps should be taken under section 290 of the Government of India Act, as amended..... with a view to create the following new Provinces, namely Maharashtra, Karnataka, Andhra, Kerala and Tamil Nad."

On that day, it was thought, that under the circumstances then prevailing, when all the States had not joined in,—there were so many other difficulties also at that time, because we had just then got freedom— it was decided that this matter would be looked into by some sort of a commission. Then, I rose in this very House— perhaps, I was sitting at that time some two or three rows behind— and said that in the larger interests of the country, this matter could wait, there was no hurry about it, and that we could go into this matter some time later. I did not press my resolution, in view of the statement made by the Prime Minister on that occasion.

But the difficulty then was this. And that is what I would like to point out. I was very careful to say that though I wanted that these States should be formed, yet I did not want that any part of the country which had any difficulty in the matter should not have its needs attended to. Therefore, I had made a special provision in respect of Gujarat in that resolution. At that time, Saurashtra, Kutch and all those different States had not been formed. I could see and realise that Gujarat with a few districts could not form a new State. So, what was to happen to Gujarat, if the other States were going to be formed, such as the Maharashtra State or the Karnataka State? For, the Kannadiga claim was there. Then, the Andhra's claim was also agitating the minds of everybody. So, I stated.

> "Gujarat now included in the Province of Bombay may, by order under this section, be inculded in the new Province of Maharashtra, if the majority of representatives of Gujarat in the Bombay Legislative Assembly agree to such inclusion, or be constituted into a separate Province, if they so desire."

At that time, it could be seen that there were some difficulties in the way of the formation of Gujarat. But at that time, even those who were in favour of linguistic provices, and I at least, never dreamt that the picture that has emerged now would emerge out of a simple demand for the division of the different areas of the country into administrative units. What happened on that occasion was that I withdrew that resolution. In pursuance of the assurance given by Government, they appointed a commission, subsequently known as the Dar Commission. I was an associate member of that Commission from Maharashtra. Without going into the difficulties, I think the present ills, or at least many of them, are due to the forces that were released as a result of the appointment of that Dar Commission. I found that attempts were made to say that the limits of every territory went far beyond what they were. And the atmosphere was created as if the Maharashtrians were people who were very linguistic, very provincial and very narrow-minded. But I could point out that I have got with me here the pamphlet entitled *The Linguistic Limits of Maha Gujarat* and I think that has created all this present tension. There is a map also in that pamphlet, which was submitted to me as an associate member of the Dar Commission which shows that the limits of Gujarat come up to Nasik, Peiut Dindori, Pimpalver and Nandarbar. Nearly half of Maharashtra is included in Gujarat in that map. Was that a good act? This pamphlet was issued by the Gujarat Research society. I do not know whether that society exists now. Probably, it came into being as a mushroom entity at that time. I do not blame anybody now present. But I am sorry that at that time forces which were never contemplated arose. With that has started the whole trouble between Maharashtra and Gujarat. Before that, the two people have been living there for centuries together as one people.

Naturally, when one claim is made, history is racked up. That was what actually happened. I am saying all this not in justification of anything, but only to point out that a whole atmosphere was created as if something had happened which was due to the anti-national character of the Maharashtrians. I emphatically deny that. If at all, the whole trouble was due to the way in which the whole matter was pursued by certain sections probably, on both sides. On one side, they wanted to have this expansionist idea of Gujarat coming practically even to my doors. In the Dar Commission, in fact, I had asked the other members, "Why do you not include me also in Gujarat, because I am an associate member? If your border could come to about 35 miles nearer my place, why do you not m-

[Shri Patankar]

clude me also in Gujarat? I had no objection to go anywhere, whether it be Gujarat or Maharashtra, because I always believed and I said that also that after all, the term meant only residence in a particular State.

That is how the trouble started. Then started recrimination. Some people started saying, 'Oh, these Maharattas are like this'. Some others started raking up geography, and some other history and so on. Just a little while ago, we heard that Bombaby is an island, surrounded by no land anywhere belonging to Maharashtra. It is surprising. As a member of the Legislative Council, while going from Poona to Bombay or *vice versa*. I had not come across any sea at all. I do not come across any sea when I go to Surat. But this is the atmosphere that is being created. Of course, I do not say that it is done only on one side; it is done on both sides. But this is what has tended to create this bad atmosphere. It is not one side only that has created this, but fanatics on both sides have spoilt a simple question which could easily have been decided in proper time, and in fact, it could well have been considered, and more properly too, by the Constituent Assembly itself.

The result is that during the last ten or twelve years, matters do not seem to have improved at all. When I made that statement. I could see what was happening. I heard evidence. Respected leaders and ancient person on both sides, whose memory ought to be cherished by every Indian, were dragged in. Some were regarded as 'pirates', some were regarded as something else. On both sides, this sort of accusation has been indulged in, thus vitiating the whole thing.

The history of Bombay shows that it was a four-lingual State, the Maharashtrians constituting 53 per cent and the Kannadigas and Gujaratis and others forming the rest 47 per cent. It has not at all been a happy administration. It is no good Shri S. K. Patil complaining about Maharashtrian Ministers. I think he ought to know much better than I do about that. Even in 1948, I had said that this was bound to be the result in a State like this, because internal jealousies, and what not, were bound to happen. I do not blame anybody in particular. But these are the things which arise out of circumstances as they existed then.

As a result of the appointment of this Commission, the question has not been solved, but an atmosphere of ill-will between these two communities has been created. Not that, therefore I mean that the question should not be solved. But it is necessary that we, early enough, settle it once and for all, and settle it justly and in a right manner.

In my statement then, I said that Maharashtra linked with Gujarat or Karnatak has a majority of 53 per cent and with contending groups on both sides, and in the present conditions of Bombay, it is a fruitful breeding ground for internal jealousies and rivalries alone. I do not blame any body. But I have been personally witness to what has been happening and I can say that from 1927 onwards, whenever the Congress was in power and was fighting elections, this is actually what has happened. If at all we have to look at the matter in the proper prospective, we cannot hold anybody responsible. Somebody said there are black marketeers and some body else was saying there are only goondas. I think that is a wrong approach to the solution of the problem. It is a human problem and it is from that point of view that it has to be solved.

What has been happening in that unfortunate State of Bombay for the last so many years? It is a progressive State. You see Bombay Beautiful. It is all right. I am, as much fond of it as anybody else and think that it is a good thing. But what is contained in it is not only the beauti-

ful land of Marine Lines, but there are also lakhs of people who sleep under the staircases of Bombay, on the footpaths thereof. I belong to Bombay. I still claim to think of Bombay the Beautiful. There are big palaces there. There are many people living there. They are bound to live there, as in the case of every city, whether it is Madras or Bombay. But what is being followed is a passionate approach to the question by one side or the other.

I then gave a warning that if public feeling was an indication—and you cannot always ignore public feeling, by whatever causes it has been created—it was no good trying apportion the blame. I said that Maharashtra must be formed into a province immediately. I then said before the Commission:

> "After the unwarranted and unjustified clamour for the separation of Bombay from Maharashtra, of which it is a living part, by a section of the non-Maharashtrians, and particularly having regard to the manner and the spirit of hostility to the Maharashtrians in which it was tried to be started smooth administration in the province of Bombay as heretofore is, in my opinion, almost impossible".

It was in these strong words that I gave a warning. If you read all my statements, you find that I had never shown any bias against anybody. I always thought that it was a simple question. But somehow or other, I could see what people were doing, the way in which things were being preached. It was in 1948 that I said that. Therefore, whatever decision you come to, you must take the history of this matter into consideration. You must take into consideration the human feelings that have been aroused and then try to settle it.

I am glad that out of the provinces for which I had moved this Resolution Karnataka, Andhra, Kerala and Tamil Nad have been formed.

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy (Mysore): There is no Cabinet Minister on the Treasury Benches.

Shri Pataskar: We were always discussing Madras and Bombay, and Bombay and Madras. Has Madras suffered in any way because it is the capital of Tamil Nad the unilingual State of Tamil Nad? But if you create this spirit and try to persist in keeping it up, then naturally things will go wrong, whether it is a unlingual State a bilingual State, a multi-lingual State or a Centrally administred territory. Therefore the whole question has to be looked at in the proper perspective and then alone we can arrive at the correct solution.

So far as the present solution is concerned, as we have witnessed, nobody seems to be satisfied with it. Now Shri S. K. Patil jumps up and puts the whole blame on those who are clamouring for linguistic provinces, terming it linguism or something like that. Was he not the Chairman of the Reception Committee of Samyukta Maharashtra Parishad of which—I was not there—Shri Deo was the President? Probably opinions might have changed. That is a different matter. But this cry of always trying to accentuate only one aspect of the matter is a dangerous thing which has defied any proper and happy solution of this complicated question. That is the root trouble. And if people persist to go on speaking and doing things in the manner in which they are proceeding now, irrespective of all talk of national unity and all that, I am sure they will never be able to find any proper solution.

Therefore, as one who some 10 or 11 years ago moved this Resolution, and who still believes in proper linguistic States—not linguistic States in which we start with the idea of one community trying to run down the other or with apprehensions of that type—I have pointed out how dangerous is the present tendency. Of course, I am sure that probably in course of time, the logic of events, the reality of the situation will put Bombay into Maharastra. I have

[Shri Pataskar]

no doubt about it, not because it is a unilingual State or anything of that type but there are other problems connected with it. For instance, if it is of Maharashtra who can object to its expansion? Even now in the present city of Bombay, 60 per cent of all the important subjects is with the Centre. What is there except land and order with the State. But it all depends upon the way in which you create a proper atmosphere for it. Otherwise, I am afraid that in this fight we will get the whole thing for which people are fighting ruined beyond and redemption.

For instance, if you separate Bombay from Maharashtra, which Chief Minister of Maharashtra will in future be able to spend and divert crores of rupees, which he might be getting from the Planning Commission for executing plans, not for relieving famines in Ahmednagar, Satara and Sholapur but for making Bombay more beautiful? I will have to search and find out a Chief Minister of Maharashtra who can ever dare to give up or utilise the money which he gets from the Centre not for the purpose of relieving the famine-stricken people of Ahmednagar, Sholapur and other parts but for trying to make, and keep, Bombay beautiful. Is it possible? Look at it from the point of view of the present relations between Maharashtra and Gujarat. It is impossible. Similar is the case with all other problems. He will be more interested in seeing that there are better irrigation facilities, and whatever money he gets from the Centre will be utilised not for earning interest or getting some money out of it from water or electricity supply, but for his own purposes. Of course, if he can do it, there is no harm in it. But, when does a man spend money for earning interest? When this house itself is in order and when there are no pressing problems, when he could find some time, money, attention and energy to be devoted to some of those projects. Therefore, if at all Bombay is to prosper and remain as it is, it must form part of Maharashtra.

As regards the bigger bilingual question, so far as I am concerned, I think a stage has been reached and the reverse is not going to take place.

Then I must try to reply to a matter of controversy between Shri S. P. Patil and Shri C. D. Deshmukh. Probably, both of them are likely not to be in the know of the thing over which they are fighting and debating. It is true that Bombay city was proposed to be made a City State. That, I think, would have been a better arrangement than what is proposed now. But the fact was that there were some people in Maharashtra—I do not know whether we should call them leaders or otherwise—who thought that if there was a City State, then it would not be ultimately as conducive to Bombay finding a place, its proper place in Maharashtra, as it otherwise would be. Therefore, it was suggested let Bombay be administered Centrally for some time and during this period let the administration of the Government of Maharashtra be carried on from Bombay so that there will be no disturbance and no apprehensions right or wrong, justified or unjustified—but the apprehensions are there and this my hon. friend will not deny. Whether it will ultimately happen or not is a different thing, but there are apprehensions that so many people are going to be thrown out of employment. I can say that the Central Government will see that—and the Prime Minister has stated, if the reports are correct—that not a single person who is at present serving in Bombay suffers on account of this change. Naturally he wants to see that. But how can he do it? I am not sure whether in the present atmosphere all that could be carried out in the spirit in which he wants it. I do not know whether it will be possible, one side contending *for* and the other side fighting *against*. I think it would require a rather more close and realistic approach, if not for anything else, at least to remove the apprehensions created I think that the present deci-

sion that Bombay city should be separated from Maharashtra is not the proper one and I do not think there is anyone in this House who is in favour of it. Of course, as I said, on account of the history of this question and certain unfortunate developments for which we need not try to put the blame on each other, it may have been necessary that for some time it may have to be Centrally administered. There is no harm. But that does not mean that the Central administration should continue for all time. It is only a temporary thing. Probably, if there is a bilingual State subsequently—I do not know how it is to come because, so far as I know, no one seems to be prepared on either side for it and the present indications are that it will not come about—until then the only other alternative is that we must make it easy for the Bombay city to merge in Maharashtra which is the proper State in which it must merge. It is from that point of view that all our attempts should be directed hereafter. Those in Bomboy should have no apprehensions about this and this is a point on which we must concentrate. Whosoever may be at fault, it is true that tension is there at present. And, nothing will be lost if, instead of trying to settle the thing in a manner by which probably the city for which they are struggling will itself be a city of ruins and shambles, they agree to have it Centrally administered for some time. But surely it must be conceded and it must be realistically realised that after all Bombay, as I said, should belong to Maharashtra—not Maharashtrians, I make that difference because Maharashtrians may not be there tomorrow—and it is from that point of view that I would stress on it.

Yesterday my friend Shri Gadgil referred to one matter and Shri Patil referred to another matter. Probably, many of the people here know that past history. One of the strongest arguments is that it was the late N. C. Kelkar, the great man from Poona—probably he had no idea that it will come to this—who raised the cry that Bombay should have a separate Congress Committee. Who had this idea then and what was the condition of Bombay State then? What was the purpose for which the Congress wanted to organise these areas? What were the limits of that Congress Committee? The suburban areas surrounding the district. All those things were decided on merits in view of the circumstances then prevailing and for purposes for which that institution was to work. Therefore it has absolutely no bearing to the late N. C. Kelkar. Probably, if some one of us had been there, he would have done the same thing. We were thinking about the separation of Sind from Bombay and all that. The whole history is being twisted and misquoted and then the trouble arises. (*Interruption*).

The next attempt was to have Bombay extended up to Poona. It is true and for that I have to blame some of my colleagues also. It was I alone who then said, 'Why have a Greater Bombay?' I put that forward before the Dar Commission also and I put forward the same view when the question came up before the Bombay Legislative Assembly. I knew that attempts were being made to extend Bombay so much that it could be formed into a separate State. Apart from the merits of it, I did not oppose it on that ground. In London there are 28 counties and why do you want to have a big Corporation of Bombay extending over so many miles of territory? That was my view. If tomorrow, Bombay is to expand, where will it expand? It has to expand into Maharashtra territory and that does not mean that Maharashtra is a different State and a different administrative unit. I was very naturally apprehensive of all this. Even Shri Gadgil was not then very much supporting me. I do not know why. Things go on happening and after 12 years we have come to this stage of the whole of Maharashtra without the Bombay city. The problem yet remains unsolved.

[Shri Patankar]

Under the present circumstances, it is clear that there are difficulties in immediately putting Bombay in Maharashtra. Therefore, our efforts now should be—whether the protagonists of bilinguism or unilinguism say Bombay should be with Maharashtra or Gujerat—that every one of us should look at this problem, this inevitable question and try to make it as easy and as least troublesome and as much to the advantage of all concerned as possible, for all those that stay in Bombay, whether they come from Gujerat or Karnatka or U.P. or any other place. That should be the sole criterion and not from the point of view of some people saying, 'You won't get Bombay for 5000 years' and other who say, 'We will take it today'. If that attitude goes on, the struggle continues. How can we have a proper atmosphere under these circumstances? My appeal to all these people is, whatever your plans may be, you should first of all try to realise that it is inevitable that ultimately Bombay must go to Maharashtra and, therefore, let us take a realistic view of the matter and see that peaceful conditions are restored. I would appeal to my friends that we should see that no apprehensions of any type in any section are unnecessarily fostered and that we should approach the question in a proper and peaceful spirit.

3 P.M.

Mr. Speaker: I call upon Shri Thanu Pillai to speak now. After him I will call Shri Gopala Rao, and after that Acharya Kripalani and after that the hon. Prime Minister and so on.

Shri B. S. Murthy: Before Shri Thanu Pillai begins, may I say this? There are some of us who have not participated either in the discussion of the Commission's Report or in the discussion of this Bill.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Members should have got up; nobody got up.

Shri B. S. Murthy: We have been getting up; we also sent in our names to you.

Mr. Speaker: I did not see the hon. Member's name. Anyhow, I will look into it.

Shri Thanu Pillai (Tirunelveli): Whenever I think of the States Reorganisation Bill, I wonder whether I am not one of the 500 grave diggers of the unity of India, which duty I am performing most unwillingly.

Seven or eight years ago, in this country 600 odd States were integrated without so much disturbance or difficulty, without so much of bloodshed as has flowed in one city only. What happened during these seven years and why should the freedom fighters of yesterday go about fighting brother against brother? They call it linguistic division, but. The decision of the Commission has not been accepted as linguism. Perhaps they are afraid of the consequences or ashamed of calling it as linguistic division. Nonetheless they make it as linguistic division in the Bill. The consequences that have flowed from this are very sad.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

We have gone on breaking our heads in the name of culture, abusing women in the name of culture, insulting leaders and leaders' photographs in the name of culture. If that is culture, surely we must not have a cultural division of India in this fashion. We are accustomed to send cultural delegations abroad, but we do not place a few stones in their pockets to be thrown there in order to show that that is our culture. One should be ashamed of what has happened here.

3-02 P.M.

We had the consequence, the very serious consequence, of our erstwhile Finance Minister resigning apparently on this issue. He was enough to say that this Government was doing things arbitrarily and not democratically and in conclusion he painted a picture of the Prime Minister in the making of a *chota* dictator. I would beg of this House and the Congressmen of this House to realise what it means abroad

to our nation. He was applauded by opposition Members, and I do not expect opposition Members to keep silent when an erstwhile member of the Government goes out and slanders the Government. Certainly they are entitled to do so. If one of their party members, especially of the Communist Party, had gone out like this in a communist country, would there be this privilege of abusing the party and the Government on the floor of the House? They are the people who talk and teach democracy in this country—it is a very baneful thing. The consequence of it at the moment is this. There is going to be an election in America....

Shri Veeraswamy (Mayuram—Reserved—Sch. Castes): As if the Congress is democratic.

Shri Thanu Pillai: We will teach democracy to you when you come before the elections. You are challenging us.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Even if he challenges, there ought not to be any lesson to be taught.

Shri Thanu Pillai: I said, in the elections, and that is what I meant. Shortly there are going to be elections in America. There is so much of feeling in the world. We are proud that our Prime Minister's mission abroad has been a success. The Democrats in America are accusing the Republicans of having lost the friendship of a country like India. The Republicans needed only quote the statement of our ex-Finance Minister, in reply, to justify their action in not having been able to settle matters and be friendly with India. Is it good for India? I do not know what prompted him to do that or whether he did not weigh the consequences, but one cannot believe that an expert like him had not weighed the consequences of his statement. In anger he has done it, but it has cost us the prestige in the world and we are only very sorry. He himself has said that no country which calls itself civilised can do certain things. I do not want to repeat and take a lesson of the manner in which he has been abusing the party. The only thing I will say is that it was more serious than Dussasana in *Mahabharata* insulting Draupadi. Our party has been belittled so much by this utterance. I am very sorry, and as a Congressman, I feel that we have chosen such people who would go out and slander a person, who would find it fit to say that they take pride that they have not been Congressmen. I warn the Congressmen of Maharashtra that their association should be very careful if they are keen about their party. If they do not care, it is a different matter.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member will not advise Congressmen and his party here, it may be done somewhere else.

Shri Thanu Pillai: I am appealing to my friends in this House.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member is warning the Congressmen.

Shri Thanu Pillai: I am appearing to my friends in the Congress Party here in the Parliament.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Party affairs might come outside.

Shri Thanu Pillai: We as a party come here.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Of course, they ought to be more careful, but that should be decided at a separate meeting.

Shri Thanu Pillai: That is all right, I thank you, Sir. What is happening here is a linguistic frenzy everywhere, from Cape Comorin to Kashmir, which ultimately will lead to language sovereignty in another five or ten years if things go on in this way. The linguistic units are not going to be very strong or self-supporting units and I am not a believer that the Central Government can always deal with all these things very equitably. There is going to be heartburning and some day some States will ask for complete sovereignty and I do not know how the law will prevent it then. If we

[Shri Thanu Pillai]

only want a foreign power to say that Tamil Nad is not a part of India, there are quite a number of foreign powers who are anxious to do that.

In the Bill the Committee has tried their best to put in the Zonal Council in an advisory capacity. The Zonal Council, as an advisory council, can do nothing. I do not know why—even if they did not want to have the zonal State—instead of having it in an advisory capacity, we canont have a sort of elected Zonal Council as a common Upper House with a common Governor, etc. for all these States put together. That will be a sort of safeguard against the pitfall which we are heading for. If the Zonal Council can be given the subjects of the Concurrent List to be administered, it will not affect the authority of the States as constituted linguistically, because at the moment there is no sign of going back on the linguistic division. From the language division developing into language sovereignty, there shall be a break between the Centre and the linguistic States. Therefore, even in this late hour, if Government would consider that a Zonal Council should be created as a common Upper House, common High Court and common Governor, that will go a long way to patch up the differences.

It will also check the idea of development on a purely linguistic basis. If the zonal Council requires some authority and if the linguistic States feel not inclined to part with their power or object to the zonal Councils being vested with higher authority as a revising council, we can say that the list of subjects in the State List will not come within the purview of the zonal State. Only the Concurrent List subjects may be given to them. That means that economic development will come partly under the zonal Government.

What people are today fighting for is not so much for language and culture as for their economic existence. Behind the urge for the linguistic idea and quarrel, you will find the talk of employment and industry. The employment potential cannot be well developed on a purely regional or linguistic basis. The natural resources will be so distributed. If two or three Governments have to deal with one region which has got certain natural resources, they may not come to an easy settlement and the benefits of development of these regional resources may not be fully made available. One State which is far away or which is not much benefited may not take much care of this. For instance, in the south zone, Karnataka, Tamil Nad, Kerala and Andhra States are there. The resources are lying in the western Ghats. The plains lie in Tamil Nad. In Kerala there is not much of land for the development of the resources. Even now, there is so much of quarrel going on between the two States. One wants certain things while the other refuses to give. This is so even when there is a multi-lingual set-up to some extent. If they become absolutely linguistic States, there is every possibility of linguistic fanatics coming into power or having more influence in those Governments. If for nothing else, purely for political reasons, they may put slogans to the people about these resources and the Government in that State may hesitate to agree to certain things which do not give full benefit to that particular State. Under those circumstances, the national economy of the country will be upset. The Central Government, with all its authority, has got to execute the plans through the State Governments. If the State Governments do not co-operate, what happens? The regions, jointly and severally, will continue to be poor and the people will be poor and any amount of philosophy will not enthuse the people. Certain regions may develop.

Today there was a reference to Bombay and there was a distinction made between the rich community and the poor community. The same

thing will come in in an all-India set-up between one region and another. One region will develop more and another less. That means that there will be regional dissensions and there is likelihood of a very serious consequence flowing from that. If not for anything else, at least for purely economic advancement, what I suggest will be desirable. The zonal Council may be a common Upper House to begin with. Ultimately the linguistic States may elect to give or surrender more of their powers to the zonal Councils, and if that happens, these will be the nucleus round which the bigger Government with the willing co-operation of the linguistic units may develop in course of time; they will develop into zonal States which hon. Shri Giri was advocating.

Coming to another section of the States Reorganisation Bill, there has been re-distribution between Tamil Nad and Kerala much against our wishes. Tamil Nad was not satisfied with all the decisions. Yet, we have accepted the position gracefully. There was some agitation in Madras, and the Government of Madras, under the able leadership of our Chief Minister, who is a better statesman, though not from Oxford or Cambridge, had seen to it that it was cooled down. Ultimately in this Bill, there has been a slight change introduced but it is a very serious change. The whole of Kollegal taluk has been given to Karnataka and Deviculam and Peermede, in spite of Tamil people being, there, to Kerala. Shencottah taluk which was given to Madras according to the SRC report has now been bifurcated. I do not mind even if the whole taluk is going to them if Madras State agrees or the people there want. I am not parochial. But the people who are there in the Shencottah town alone are coming to Madras whereas the Hill is going to the Kerala State. Perhaps They are thinking in terms of having straight lines as boundaries. Shencottah, as it is, bulges out into Madras State. If the whole taluk is given to Madras, it will bulge out in Kerala. But, if it is straightened here, let it apply in the case of other areas also—Deviculam, Peermede and Gudalur. Whatever is due to Tamil Nad, let it come and let the division be complete. Do not apply one formula to one area and another formula to another area. It means that some people should begin to criticise these things saying that "we behave like good boys and we do not go on breaking heads and so we are not listened to." That impression should not be created. To the people who are willing to be co-operative in spite of any amount of real grievances, no justice has been done.

In clause 2 of the Bill, they have changed the date from 1st March to 1st July. According to the draft Bill, only one division of Puliyara Hill pakuthy was given. The Committee is now informed that they have now re-demarcated the boundary and transferred the portion lying to the west of the watershed line to another taluk so that the rest is called Shencottah. It looks very simple as if only Puliyara Hill Pakuthy was added to Kerala and the rest came to Madras. It is not so. Other than the Puliyara Hill Pakuthy, there are other areas like Achanputhur Pakuthy which were not mentioned at all and which were now divided and added on to some taluk or district of Kerala State. So, when the rest of it comes, it does not come in the form in which it was originally agreed to or it was intended. It is a very serious matter.

We have changed the date from 1-3-56 to 1-7-56. If any other States had taken care to demarcate their borders and if Parliament was not knowing about that and if you effect this change, what all has happened in other States between March and July will be affected. Therefore, I request the Government to reconsider this position. The Joint Committee has decided like this and I have moved an amendment in this connection. If the whole of Shencottah is prepared to go to Kerala, I am willing. Let them give us some

[Shri Thanu Pillai]

other taluk like Palghat the exchange so that it may be just. Let Shencottah come to us or let there be equity in division.

Shri Tulsidas: Sir, I thank you for giving me this opportunity to speak on this important issue. I have been opposing the question of reorganisation all the while because, in my mind, there was a feeling that this question of reorganisation was bound to create certain controversies which would hamper our progress. My conviction has grown stronger in view of the speeches in this House and outside. I am really pained at this. It is a feeling that is prevalent all over the country. This question has created controversies in the country as well as in this House, controversies of a very serious nature.

Sir, you know very well that we have a very bold programme for the next five years. We want every section of the community in this country to contribute its best towards the progress and development of the country. The Home Minister in his speech had mentioned that practically one year of the Second Five Year Plan wil be wasted in deciding these controversies. You can imagine, Sir, the amount of harm that will be done on account of these difficulties which have been created for, in my opinion no high gains.

There has been a certain amount of indication before that the linguistic provinces will create more homogeneity in the country and it will be better for the progress of the country. But, on the contrary, the position is entirely different. The country has undergone, only recently on account of the partition, a lot of difficulties. We had also a number of administrative problems after the integration of the different States in the country. You know, Sir, very well how difficult it was to get over those difficulties and it is only now, after the end of the First Five Year Plan, that we are trying to do something, which is much bigger and bolder and in fact, it is to a certain extent beyond our capacity.

We have still to depend a large amount on foreign aid for our Second Five Year Plan. If those countries, who really desire to assist us in our plan, find the situation as it is just now in the country, then I am afraid the harm which will be done to the country will be very much bigger than what we are going to face with this reorganisation. I personally believe and I still feel that it is not late. The Prime Minister and the Government should be bold enough and courageous, after seeing what has happened, to stop this reorganisation. It is not too late. After all, people say that time has elapsed and, therefore, we cannot do anything more. But I say it is not too late. When they find the heat and the amount of controversies that have been created in the country, the Prime Minister can still take that step and save this country from this—in my opinion—catastrophe.

Shri Kanavade Patil (Ahmednagar North): There is no catastrophe.

Shri Tulsidas: I am afraid, in the heat of this debate we are forgetting the real priority of things required in this country. After all, when we talk of the Second Five Year Plan and when we talk of the economic conditions in the country we think in terms of priority. what is that priority? That priority is to increase the standard of living of every individual in this country. If that is to be considered as of the utmost priority or having the first priority, then in my opinion, this question of reorganisation of States does not come up in priority. This can wait and I am sure this will have a much better and salutary effect on the progress of our country.

Sir, it pained me to hear our ex-Finance Minister, who has just relinquished his post, I heard his first statement and I heard him today. It is really painful that a person of his calibre, his stature and his eminence, who has handled the First Five Year Plan and who was in charge of the entire finances and monetary policies of the country, now ceases to be an Indian. (*An Hon. Member*: Question.)

Shri Tulsidas: Well, to my mind he seems to be so.

He considers it much important to consider a particular section of the country when a particular harm is done to that particular section of the country. His words have created much more controversies instead of creating anything towards a settlement. He tells us today that Bombay City is the life-blood of Maharashtra. Maybe it is the life-blood of Maharashtra, but it is the life-blood of the whole of India. There is no doubt about it and he knows it fully well. In spite of Calcutta being a bigger city, in spite of Madras being equally important as Bombay, Bombay has always been held to be the nerve centre of India; and if Bombay is to be, a sort of, tossed about with different ideas then one can imagine what will be done to the country.

Then he says that Bombay and Maharashtra will be completely economically finished. Look at this. In the heat of the debate even a man of his stature forgets that it is not only Maharashtra which will suffer, but it is the whole of India that will suffer. The other day my friend Shri Asoka Mehta said that the people of Kutch and the people of Saurashtra—those who live in Bombay know it fully well —depend for their livelihood on the Bombay City. If the point of view of those people is not to be considered and the question is to be decided from the point of view of one section of the country, then I am afraid the harm that will be done to this country is going to be so tremendous that it is not going to help our progress in any way.

He also mentioned that if Bombay is kept separate it will give scope for black-marketing, tax-dodgers and so on. He has been the Finance Minister of this country for the last six years. It was his duty to see that there was no black-marketing or tax-dodging taking place in this country. Having remained with the Government for the last six years, having under his charge the finances of the country, he today complains that if this thing happens you are throwing the city in the hands of some people which is going to be harmful to the country.

Shri Kanavade Patil: You want Bombay City for blackmarketeers.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Hon. Members should not be impatient. They shall also have their chance.

Shri Tulsidas: My friends sometimes feel very impatient about this question of Bombay. Sir, I come from Bombay. Though I am not coming from a constituency near about Bombay City, I come from a constituency which belongs to Bombay State as it is today and, if I, much less a person who has been the ex-Finance Minister, talk merely in terms of my constituency and say that my constituency should not suffer no matter what happens to the whole country, then I really feel it is unfortunate in this country that we have not yet forgotten the belief that we are not one race, we belong to one part of India and that we do not belong to India. In that case we do not talk as Indians. Sir, we are Indians first and everything else come only afterwards. But all the speeches that we have heard here are from the point of view of either Gujerathis, Maharashtrians, Bengalis or Punjabis.

An Hon. Member: What about capitalists?

Shri Tulsidas: Capitalists also exist in all parts of India; it is not only in the Bombay City. Therefore, it is wrong to talk of capitalism and socialism as if everything was concentrated in the City of Bombay and nowhere-else.

This is what I really do not understand. When my hon. friend Shri C. D. Deshmukh was sitting on the other side I had always differences of opinion with him, but I had always felt that one has to take what was of priority for the country, what was in the larger interests of the country no matter whether a particular section suffered or not.

[Shri Tulsidas]

Even with this difference of opinion—I have tremendous respect for him—in this heat, what has happened to him? I do not understand. Why does he, today, think in terms only of a particular section or of his own constituency? He believes in a bilingual State which is not feasible now as some say. If a person believes in a particular thing, then why cannot he do something about it? Why cannot he make efforts even now to do something about it by which something of what he believes it can be achieved? I am sure that in this House there are large sections of people who believe in the tragedy of such a reorganisation. Though they believe in it, they have not the courage to come out and say so openly and work for the advancement of the country. Here is a solution, and that is the solution which has been worked out by different committees and also the States Reorganisation Commission. I do not see any reason why that solution cannot be worked out. Why cannot the people who believe in certain things come out and openly say, "Here is the solution and there is nothing possible. This is the only way by which you can create at least an atmosphere in the country and arrive at a solution. Let us have an end of it"? Otherwise, I am afraid that this particular question is going to agitate the minds of the people in every part of the country for a long time. It will create more and more trouble.

My suggestion is, as I said, that this Bill must be dropped. I oppose this particular Bill because, really, it is not in the interests of the country at the present stage to go ahead with this reorganisation. The Bombay issue has been continuously agitating the minds of several people. There are a number of other questions also which agitate them and me. Take for instance, the question of transfer of territory from Bihar to West Bengal. You, Sir, have just now mentioned the question of Punjab. Similar controversy is present all over the country

Is it advantageous or fair to have this question settled today when we have enormous problems in this country, when we have to see that the standard of living of the people is raised, and when we have to look to the progress and advancement of the people in all ways? Why do we want to waste our energy over this Bill? On the one hand we are told that our administrative services are not having enough people to look after the execution of the Plan. On the other hand, this reorganisation requires a large number of people to carry out the changes. How are we then going to create better living standards? On the contrary, this new change or reorganisation will create at least a lot of difficulty and result in much waste of energy. Because one has to attend to this reorganisation, the programme with regard to the Plan will suffer.

We know very well that on account of the changes created by the States Reorganisation Bill a number of changes will have to be effected. Already, in different States, much energy is being wasted in order to see that the different officers are put in different States, that allocations are made from one State to another and so on. There are other important questions concerning internal matters and also concerning international issues. Our Prime Minister is having hands full. Look at the present position. The Prime Minister will have to be burdened with a large amount of new and different problems, while he has already a number of international problems to be tackled. The Finance Minister has resigned and the Prime Minister has to take over the finance portfolio. Over and above that, he has to see that these controversies arising out of the reorganisation of States are settled once and for all. Is it worth at this stage to carry on this controversy instead of doing something constructive for the uplift of the country?

My friends to my right are very much interested in seeing that the

country is disintegrated, that there should be a lot of controversy in the country. They are very happy to see to these things. They want all this trouble. They wish for it, and they encourage it. Unfortunately, what is happening further? Even some of my friends on my left have joined hands with my friends on my right! Shri Pataskar said that there is an unholy alliance. What further unholy alliances there will be, I do not know. Members on this side joining hands with those on the other side is something strange!

Shri Raghavaiah (Ongole): It is an irony of fate.

Shri Tulsidas: I agree. There are problems of graver import which need our urgent attention and which we should consider much more seriously. It is no use thinking in terms of local interest and wasting time in speeches full of heat, excitement and controversy over the reorganisation of States.

Let us take the most important State where there is great controversy—the Bombay State. My friend Shri Pataskar gave out the history of what he did all these years and that he was not listened to. I am not in favour of this Bill at the present time. There has been no question of anybody feeling that Bombay State, though it was a multi-lingual State, has suffered on account of its having been a multi-lingual State. There was no question of any controversy. The administration of Bombay has always been considered to be the top-notch.

Shri B. S. Murthy: Thanks to moneybags.

Shri Tulsidas: There are moneybags all over. Shri Gadgil said the other day that he is a socialist,—because he has nothing to lose, naturally. That is why he said so. I am not bringing out that issue at all now, but my point is that you are now creating difficulties in the way of Bombay. It is being chequered in every possible way. Its administration was going on perfectly well. Progress in that State was much better than in any other State. What does it show? It shows that when there are multi-lingual people remaining together, they create a much better understanding and constructive work is possible. Formerly the people there did not think of any other thing, excepting the administration of the State in a proper way. But it is difficult for people who have not stayed in a city or a State which is cosmopolitan in nature to appreciate the benefits of a multi-lingual area. I am not saying that other States have not made as much progress as Bombay State has shown, but when people ask, "what is this cosmopolitan nature of a city?", I would like to request them to go and stay for a few days in a cosmopolitan city; and only then they could realise the cosmopolitan city; and only then they could realise the cosmopolitan nature of a city. Of course, Calcutta is a much bigger city than Bombay. But it is for everyone to go and visit Calcutta and Bombay and then come to the conclusion whether Calcutta is a cosmopolitan city or Bombay is a cosmopolitan city. The cosmopolitan nature can only exist when there are multi-lingual people residing in one and the same city or State. It has been proved so, and because of that reason Bombay has remained the nerve-centre not for financial, cultural or economic progress of India but also it has remained the topnotch city in every respect. But then we are trying to break that character of the State and of the city. We are trying to break the whole State.

As I said last time, we are having a cold-blooded murder of an important State like Bombay. It is being completely cut off in every possible way. At any rate they are trying to do so. I find that my hon. friend Shri C. D. Deshmukh is also being swayed in, into this particular sphere. I do feel that if really people believe that the atmosphere will be not so good as it was formerly—I believe that the atmosphere is growing bad—at least

[Shri Tulsidas]

for Heaven's sake, stop this reorganisation. If still you want to proceed with it, I would request the hon. Prime Minister to consider this suggestion, namely, where there is no controversy, let the reorganisation be proceeded with. We do not mind it. But if there is any trouble anywhere, let us not proceed with the reorganisation there. It is no use having this controversy all along. It is not going to end up. Parochial interests are bound to continue, if we go on with the reorganisation, and the struggle to avoid it will be much stronger than the one we want to put forth in respect of general development of the country during the second Plan period.

My friend Shri Pataskar said that he did not believe in just linguistic States at all and that he believed in having multi-lingual States also. But in name, he prefers only linguistic States, and nothing else.

He says that Bombay belongs to Maharashtra. You can't say which belongs to whom. I do not understand this.

Shri Pataskar: I made it clear, Maharashtra.

Shri Tulsidas: I submitted a memorandum to the S.R.C. that no State should be named after a language. You may call it State 1, 2 etc. This question is so difficult.

Shri B. S. Murthy: That is the Russian method. You are borrowing this from them.

Shri Tulsidas: I am glad I am borrowing something from them.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: His complaint is that the hon. Member also sometimes agrees with them.

Shri Tulsidas: My hon. friend Shri Asoka Mehta said that communism and capitalism have come to stay in such a way that they have come nearer to each other in a very fair way. I do feel that this proposal of reorganisation must be stopped at this stage. We should not proceed with it; if at all we proceed with it, we must proceed where there is no controversy or no bitter controversy, if I may use that expression, so that the parties may learn a lesson and come to some understanding.

People talk about linguistic minorities and majorities. Shri Frank Anthony has spoken a lot about this and other friends have also spoken about this. Fears have been expressed with regard to safeguards for the minorities. This is very essential if we want to proceed with this proposal. I do not want to make any suggestion. This question of the minorities is a very important one. Every State has a minority. If we proceed with linguistic States, the common language will not have a place in this country.

With these words, I oppose this Bill even though it is rather late.

Shri Gopala Rao (Gudivada): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, we have reached the final stage in the reorganisation of States. It surprises me at this final stage to hear interesting speeches, asking to stop this, put an end to this, as if it is an accident. In spite of the opposition of all these forces, as a result of the mighty movement for the last 30 years, this Bill has come up out of the 14 Part A States, in spite of the opposition, though Government have not accepted the linguistic principle completely,—they have only accepted it hesitatingly and all sorts of obstacles have been put in—they have been forced to introduce this Bill with 13 States formed on a linguistic basis. Only Punjab is a bi-lingual State.

Many of my friends have dealt at length with the Bombay question. The biggest blunder in this matter committed by the Government is their denial to integrate Bombay with Maharashtra. If not today, tomorrow the Maharashtrians will win their claim. They are fighting for a just case.

Coming to Punjab, I do not know why, when 13 States have been organised on the linguistic basis, there is a bi-lingual State here. Are the people of Punjab opposing this linguistic principle? I do not believe it. From the information we get, the Punjabi-speaking people want a Punjabi State and the people living in Hariana, in a united voice, want a different State. They do not want to be in the Punjabi State. That was the memorandum submitted by several M.L.A.'s and other people when the S.R.C. visited the Punjab. It is good that P.E.P.S.U. is also merged with Punjab. Most of the Punjabi-speaking people have come under one State. These Hariana people, as many of my hon. friends have said the other day, are backward, poverty-stricken and neglected and in every respect they are being treated in a different manner. That is why the members from that area, whether they belonged to this party or that, submitted a memorandum to the S.R.C. that they should be separated from the Punjabi State. Government are not prepared to accept this linguistic principle. At the same time, they are prepared to set up Regional Committees. What is the basis for these Regional committees? Punjabi or Hindi-speaking areas. What does the formation of Regional Committees indicate? It indicates that in reality, people want separate States on the linguistic basis Had it been conceded, there would have been a better scope for the prosperity of the Hariana people and there would have been a proper atmosphere today. Instead of accepting the democratic principle, Government try to appease certain elements, sometimes these elements and sometimes the other elements, creating an undesirable atmosphere. That is why I say that here also the reorganisation should have been on the basis on which the other 13 States have been formed.

Coming to the Andhra Pradesh question, I need not narrate the whole story as to how the Andhras are advancing in respect of linguistic States, as to how they fought for a separate State and how they fought for Visal Andhran and how it was conceded But there is a clause in the Constitution (Ninth) Amendment Bill that there shall be no elections in the Andhra Pradesh in 1957. No valid reason has been given why the Andhras, who have been fighting all these years for Vishalandhra, have been denied an opportunity to express their opinion at this auspicious moment. It is not a case of merger of one district or one taluk. The ground on which it is denied is that there were elections only two years ago. Two portions, 9 districts from Hyderabad and 12 districts of Andhra are being merged and a new State is being formed. With the formation of the new State, in every field, economic, political and social, a new alignment of forces has taken place. People are full of aspirations. At this stage it is better to give an opportunity to the legislators to come with a new mandate from the people. There is no reason for denying elections to the Andhras. This is against the principle followed in other States. In the P.E.P.S.U. also I think elections were held late in 1954 or early in 1955. So also in the case of Travancore-Cochin late 1954 or early 1955. Why is there this discrimination? What is the reason for denying elections in Andhra?

Shri B. S. Murthy: Special favour to Andhra.

[PANDIT THAKUR DAS BHARGAVA *in the Chair*]

3-49 P.M.

Shri Gopala Rao: Favour or disfavour? I think that the Government have not taken a proper decision in this matter. Some people are guided by the party interests. In the present position, it so happened that some are in an advantageous position. Suppose they go to the polls. They are in such an advantageous position that they never thought of or could ever think of.

[Shri Gopala Rao]

They do not want to spoil that position. That is why they are guided by such narrow party interests. There is no wide principle on which this denial is made.

I am surprised to learn that some responsible persons in the Government, when they were asked why the elections are being avoided in Andhra, said that it was the decision of all the parties in Andhra. That is completely wrong. I want to make at least our position clear in this context. In Andhra the Communist Party never came to an agreement nor committed itself that elections should be postponed up to 1962. What actually happened is this. At a time when certain forces were working against the formation of Vishalandhra, the Communist Party in Andhra which has been fighting for the last 12 years for Vishalandhra, thought that in the broad interests of the people it would be better to allay the fears of certain Congress friends who were afraid of their future that if the new State was formed, new elections would be conducted, and they may not be returned in the new elections. At that time, taking the wider interest of Andhra we said that we would not press for immediate elections if the only obstacle to the formation of Vishalandhra was the question of the conduct of immediate elections. Fortunately, the Government, the Congress Committee and the M.L.As. unanimously stood for Vishalandhra. There was practically no occasion for us to come to an agreement like this. In the same way when our leaders met the Members of the Cabinet there also said that they were not particular of immediate elections if that was the only obstacle in the way. But, as a matter of fact, that was never an obstacle in the way of the formation of Vishalandhra. The real obstacle was the disruptive slogan of a separate State for Telengana. Here, I want to congratulate the Home Minister who stood firmly against the disruptionist demand for a separate Telengana and against the vacillations of his own colleagues and conceded Vishalandhra at this stage. But, at the same time, that cannot be a basis or reason for avoiding elections in a part of the country where more than two crores of people are living. That is why I request that elections should be held in Andhra along with the rest of India. Let the people of Andhra have a chance in the new State. Let them express their new aspirations.

Coming to the boundary question, a boundary commission should be constituted and it should decide once and for all all border disputes. There are certain areas about which there is no dispute about the facts. For instance, in Serovancha 90 per cent. of the people speak Telugu. In Kolar District, except for Malur and Kolar Taluks, the rest are predominantly Telugu-speaking. This will be accepted by our Kannadiga friends. Such areas may be included here and now.

Coming to statutory safeguards for minorities, these should be provided for the languages both in the matter of education and in administration to the extent possible. The minority should be absorbed in the services where they form a substantial minority. But according to this Bill, what ultimately emerges as far as the minorities are concerned is this. It does not provide proper safeguards and the mechanism to implement the safeguards. The whole difficulty is that, from the experience we have gained, the linguistic minorities are not satisfied with the present safeguards or the way they are being implemented. It is the duty of the States and the Centre to see that the linguistic minorities do not feel that they are being treated in a different manner.

As far as secondary education is concerned, simply a note is attached by the Home Minister. I do not know what will be the statutory position of that note. Simply it will be a directive. It may be respected, or it may not be respected by the States. That is why for secondary education also there must be a sta-

tutory provision. For instance, in a city like Hyderabad with a million population, half a million are Urdu-speaking. At this place certainly there must be provision to arrange for education in Urdu even in colleges. It is a concrete example I am giving, but you cannot apply it to all places. That is why when you take the question of linguistic minorities, the question arises through what mechanism or agencies these safeguards will be enforced. That will be the crux of the problem. Some friends have suggested the good offices of the Governor may be utilised for this enforcement. Some have suggested there should be a Commissioner or a special officer or a Board. Whatever be the mechanism, there should be a statutory provision. That is why I propose that there should be a statutory minorities' board to look after the minorities' interests. In the same way, even at the State level it is better to have some sort of minority board.

Shri S. C. Deb (Cachar-Lushai Hills): We have come to the final stage of our States reorganisation scheme and redrawing the map of India. I am generally in support of this Bill as it has emerged from the Joint Committee and I appreciate the labour that has been put in by our elder statesman the Chairman, and the Members of the Joint Committee.

I would like to draw the attention of the House to the eastern region of India. There, the States Reorganisation Commission made some recommendations regarding Tripura and Manipur, but in our Bill there is some difference. I do not know why this difference is there. As far as Tripura is concerned, the Commission has said:

> "As a small Part C State, Tripura cannot obviously stand by itself....its merger in Assam, in our opinion, can be supported among other reasons on the ground that it will be desirable to bring the entire border between India and Pakistan in this region under one single control namely, that of the Assam Government."

That is the recommendation of the States Reorganisation Commission.

4 P.M.

As you know, there is also an agitation in the Tripura State for having a democratic set-up. The other day, my hon. friend from Tripura also pressed for it. It is natural that the people there should press for having a democratic set-up, and the agitation for that will be there. But Tripura's geographical position is such that unless a direct connection is established, and unless communication and transport are provided so that trade could be carried on through Assam, it is not possible for the Central Government from here to feed that State for all time to come. That is why the States Reorganisation Commission made that recommendation. I do not know why the Central Government have not accepted it.

The Chief Minister of Assam, while that recommendation was considered in the State Legislative Assembly remarked as follows:

> "We feel that the national unity, solidarity and security of India are the most essential factors and are the over-riding considerations to be borne in mind in any scheme of reorganisation of States in India. Administrative convenience, historical growth, geographical contiguity, financial strength economic stability are other powerful considerations in determining the boundaries of a State.....
>
> From the point of national security and unity of India it will appear clearly that the entire region to the north-east of Pakistan needs an antegrated administration from various points of view and should form one administrative homogeneous unit so that it can be developed as a self-sufficient economic zone under a plan."

[Shri S. C. Deb]

This is the view of the Chief Minister of Assam. The same is also the view of the Assam Provincial Congress Committee, which adopted a resolution favouring the merger of Tripura in Assam. It also adopted a resolution for the merger of Manipur. When there is agitation in these two areas, namely, Tripura and Manipur, for a democratic set-up it is very necessary from the point of view of homogeneity of that area and also security, that they should be merged in Assam, as recommended by the States Reorganisation Commission, (*Interruptions*). If it could not be done now, owing to practical considerations, it should be done in the near future. If it is to be done in the near future, why should it not be done now? When our Government are taking so much pains to merge Telangana and Andhra, and other parts in other States, and they are making so much of effort to effect reorganisation in other areas, I do not know why this little part should not be merged right now in Assam, so that the Central Government would not be put to the trouble of running the help to this part every day? Whether there are floods, or whether there is scarcity every time, the Central Government have to incur expenses as at present, and transport the necessary commodities by air to Agartala. Why should this continue for long? When there is an agitation in these places for democratic set-up, when we recognise also the right of every individual to have a democratic set-up, why should not these little parts be merged with Assam now itself, so that Government could have the necessary security measures, and keeping in view the contiguity and homogeneity of these areas, the development of the whole area may be taken up together? The problems are there in the plains as also in the hills. There are security troubles everywhere. We have got Pakistan also on the border. The border trouble is there in Tripura, in Assam and other areas too. The other day, my hon. friend Shri L. Jogeswar Singh talked of infiltration in those areas, particularly, in the Naga Hills area. There, there is a no-man's-land on the Burma border. We do not know whether any help is coming from that area of no-man's-land. I am glad that the Prime Minister is here and I would like to tell him that we should develop a port at Rangoon and have a corridor-line bordering Tripura, Assam and Manipur, so that security measures can be taken in an effective and smooth way. That way, I believe, our difficulties in regard to transport, communication, trade, development of industries and so on, will all be solved. I would apeal to Government to take a little more care in regard to this area.

I have moved an amendment also in this regard. When the Central Government are taking so much pains for the development of the whole of India with a view to its integration, security and unity, I would beseech them to take a little more care of that area, and adopt a solution on the lines I am suggesting.

Shri L. Jogeswar Singh (Inner Manipur): On a point of information. I would like to tell my hon. friend that before he asks for the merger of these areas in Assam, Assam must first control the Naga Hills troubles. When Assam is not in a position to manage the Naga Hills, how is it that my hon. friend says, that it will be able to discharge its responsibility in Tripura and Manipur? When the Naga Hills area has not been controlled, how is my hon. friend so much interested in Manipur and Tripura being taken over by Assam?

[MR. SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

4-08 P.M.

Shri S. C. Deb: If all these States are taken together, then there will be no trouble.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Mr. Speaker, Sir, a week ago today, I returned to Delhi after visiting many

countries and great cities in the West, and meeting many leading personalities there. I tried to understand the great movements that were taking place there, the thoughts in the minds of people there and the changes that had taken place. Even more so, I tried to understand what reflection there was of India in the minds of the people that I met in Europe.

I was interested in that naturally, because even as I watched something of the stuff of history being made in Europe, I wanted to know how far the history we might be making here was reflected in the minds of people in Europe. I found they were greatly interested, indeed sometimes more than interested, in what was happening in India, because they felt that something very significant was happening here something that would not only change India, but would affect other countries and other continents. And I thought then of the work that we do here in India, the great problems that face us, and the tremendous responsibility of this Parliament of India. This Parliament of India indeed has this responsibility of making the history of India.

That was one thought that struck me. Another thought that struck me as I travelled from country to country was of how the old frontiers had gradually meant less and less. Within an hour or two, I travelled from the capital of a great counrty to the capital of another great country. There were problems, certainly many problems and many conflicts, but this idea of national frontiers became less and less important somehow in the modern scheme of things.

I mention this because here we are considering with considerable heat and passion not the frontiers of nations but the borders inside the nation between two States or provinces. If the frontiers of nation become relatively less important than they were, and if in the course of a few years, they may almost be ignored for many matters, how much less important are these problems of State boundaries which we are considering? I do not wish to minimise their importance, but I do wish this House to consider this question in proper perspective. We are apt to lose that perspective in the heat of debate or otherwise. I know that this question which we are considering, and this Bill and its provisions, have moved people strongly, deeply and that even now there is a great deal of feeling about them. I do not suppose that the most ideal solutions, whatever they might have been, could possibly have been pleasing to everybody.

So far as I am concerned—indeed, I might say, so far as Government here is concerned—it is of no great significance to us what part of India goes into this State boundary or that. Yes, certainly we must consider what is more desirable from various points of view. But in the ultimate analysis, it does not make much difference where one little part is from the Government point of view. From the individual's point of view or the State's point of view, it has certain importance; I do not deny that.

Therefore, the Government of India approached this question, if I may use word, more or less objectively and without any particular desire to impose this decision or that. We have been told that we did not go through the proper procedure of consultation and decision etc. But I think any person who knows what has happened in the last six seven or eight months in this country, will also know that the amount of consultation and discussion about this matter that we have had is without parallel. In fact, many people say—and perhaps, rightly—that we overdid this: it would have been much simpler if we had not tried to consult hundreds of thousands of persons in this process and thereby perhaps added to the confusion. However, it is a fact that this question has roused people. But I wish this House to realise this, and first of all look at this picture in proper perspective, lest we forget that perspective and get lost in the passions of the moment. Secondly, to realise that

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

however important these questions of borders might be, they are, after all, administrative divisions inside the country. Thirdly, whatever we may decide today, surely nobody prevents us afterwards, subsequently, from making any variation.

I realise that nobody wants to decide things and change them everyday. That is a different matter. But nothing is final in the sense that it cannot be changed in the future.

Now, our difficulty has been that we have tried too much perhaps to balance respective viewpoits, to try to find a common way, to find as large a measure of agreement as possible. And naturally, in doing so, we have often succeeded in displeasing many people. Yet I would beg of you to remember that in this very very complicated business which affected the whole of India, by far the greater part of India has accepted, broadly speaking, the proposals that are made. True, very important questions remain; among them perhaps the one that has been talked about most is the question of Bombay and Maharashtra.

Now, I have felt—I say so with respect—that perhaps the approach to these questions has been too much marred by strong language and by direct or indirect reproaches, and, if I may use the word, by running down this group or that group this community or that, not only in regard to Bombay, but in regard to other places too—whether it is Bengal, Bihar or other places. I would beg this House to consider whether it helps in the slightest the consideration of these problems by running down any province, any community, in any part of the country, by considering one part more capable, more courageous, more independent or more nationalistic—whatever it may be. We are all here as Members chosen by some constituency or other in India. Naturally, we are interested in that constituency. But I submit that we are here as something else also. I am not here merely as Member for the eastern part of Allahabad district. I consider myself the Member for India here, and I do submit that every Member of Parliament is a Member for India. We are not members of some local municipality or district to consider the particular interests of that area only and forget the rest of India. We have to consider every question, I hope to the best of our ability, in relation to the whole country. I am not Prime Minister of Allahabad district. I am Prime Minister of India by grace of this House, and I have to think or try to think in terms of India. I may make a mistake. Of course, I make mistakes; all of us make mistakes. But I do submit that when we begin to challenge each other's *bona fides*, then any discussion and any consideration of any problem on merits becomes a little difficult.

Let us consider these problems from this larger point of view, realising that even if some decision which we dislike is made it does not make a terrible lot of difference, realising that if the mistake is made, it is a mistake in a narrow sphere and it can be corrected later, because the greatest possible mistakes and the greatest possible error in this is having a wrong mind and a wrong approach to this problem and creating an atmosphere of conflict which is so vital to the development of any big thing in India. That is the basic approach.

Some hon. Members may well say, 'It is all very well; your intentions may be very good, but where have you landed us with your good intentions?' It is perfectly true that we have landed ourselves in a bit of mess. I admit it and I admit my responsibility for it because, naturally, as Prime Minister and otherwise also, I am at least partly responsible for it. I do not wish to run away from it. It sometimes happens that in trying to avoid one difficulty one lands in another. But there it is.

I do not wish to go into the past history of all these 8 months' debate and consideration; but we have arrived at a certain stage now and we have to look at the picture as it is. Many things could have been done, large bilingual States and many other things might have been done; they might be done later too. I do not rule that out. But, what exactly can we do at the present moment so as to promote and preserve and help to bring about this larger atmosphere of co-operative endeavour? In a decision which we take—the decision may please somebody or displease somebody; it may be a right or wrong decision—the main thing to consider is what is the final result of it in terms of goodwill or ill-will. That is the main thing.

On several occasions, in regard to this very matter of Bombay and Maharashtra, we varied previous decisions. Each time we varied it—I am talking about the earlier stages—we landed in a fresh difficulty. We did it at the suggestion of somebody, some respected colleague of ours and then, they themselves wanted something else. Ultimately we landed ourselves in this difficulty that any attempt to change it probably resulted in a worse situation than the first one.

Hon. Member, Shri Deshmukh said, he preferred a City State formula to the present state of affairs. So did we and that was our first decision. And, the hon. Member will remember that on one occasion, he told us not only on his behalf but responsibility and authoritatively on behalf of others too that we should adopt the City State formula. We adopted it although we had come to some other conclusion because we were anxious and eager to please. But not 48 hours had passed when we were told. No; go back upon that; we won't approve that. We want back upon it and so we shifted about in our anxiety to arrive at some decision which carried the largest measure of agreement and consent.

The hon. Member referred to what he called two crucial decisions which were taken without consultation. I am in a difficulty about this matter because I am really, totally and absolutely unable to follow him. I do not know where he gets his facts from. I consulted my papers, my Cabinet records and everything. There are two decisions—I leave out for the moment the statement that I made in Bombay. The first decision was taken, I am say, absolutely and repeatedly with the consultation of everybody and my colleagues in the whole Cabinet. I have no doubt about it. Finally, I say—leave out the intermediate stages—this Bill itself was placed before the Cabinet. The Bill, after all, contains it and it was the Cabinet that adopted it before it came to this House. That is the usual procedure. I do not understand how anyone can say without forgetting all these that this decision was adopted without consultation. There was more consultation than on any other subject that I have had since I have been Prime Minister.

The other matter is a small matter; what mistakes I might have made or anything said about me. [Shri Deshmukh was kind enough and good enough to say that he did not refer to me when he said that there was a certain animus. I thank him for that statement, but it is a small matter after all as to what I am and what I may be. But, it is a much bigger matter as to what our method of Government is, what the procedure we follow in our Cabinet and the Government of India and in this Parliament and elsewhere. It is no small thing. Are we following wrong procedures; are we overriding everybody and just imposing some individual will, mine or a small committee's will over this Parliament, over the Government, over the country?

That is a vital matter. It is more vital than, I say, this whole States Reorganisation Bill. If we go wrong, how are we to function? It is charge

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

the hon. Member has made; it is a very serious charge. It is not easy to reply to it and to justify my own conduct. But I do submit that he has done little justice to his colleagues in the Cabinet and even less justice to himself when he made that charge. He has functioned in this Cabinet for 6 years or more and he has been a valued and respected member and colleague of ours. Now, he makes this charge against his colleagues after 6 years of functioning, together, a charge however much I may be guilty of or deserve, and I do submit it is a very very unfair charge on all my responsible colleagues in the Cabinet.

However, there was this question of the statement that I made at Bombay. Now, what is the crucial decision and the statement that I made in Bombay? Repeatedly I had said at Amritsar Congress and at various other places that statement had been made repeatedly—that Bombay will be given an opportunity to decide by some democratic process what it should do and where it should go to. For my part, I would be exceedingly happy if Bombay went to Maharashtra. I have absolutely no reason against it and I shall be completely and absolutely frank in this House that I think there are many valid arguments, good arguments for Bombay going to Maharashtra. But I also say that other valid arguments are also to be considered on the other side. In this difficulty we thought, many of us thought, that the best way was to allow Bombay to decide. It may have been done even now. But, as I pointed out, the conditions have been such that so much passion has been aroused that it was not yet the right time to decide that. Let things cool down. I have repeatedly said, "Let normality prevail and then let it be decided by them". I do not naturally mean that you will have a plebiscite or referendum and all that; but, if there is a good atmosphere, I have no doubt that it would be far simpler to settle this matter without any such cumbrous procedure. I was hoping for that and I still hope for that. In Bombay at the meeting of the All-India Congress Committee, I was not to my thinking making any great decision or announcement on a very big thing. I was merely stating what I had stated repeatedly—my view—and I am something; after all, I am the Prime Minister of India. And a Prime Minister is a Minister and he can lay down the policy of the Government—it may be repealed or it may be anything. I know something about democratic procedure; I know something about party procedure; I know something as to what the Prime Minister's duties are, and in the Constitution we have and in the Constitution that Britain has, the Prime Minister is a linchpin of Government. To say that the Prime Minister cannot make a statement is a monstrous statement itself. I entirely fail to understand where the hon. Member has got his acquaintance of democracy and what under the present Constitution of India and England the Prime Minister is and what he can do and what he cannot do. I am something more than the Prime Minister: we are something more; we are the children of the Indian Revolution. And although we may be toned down here and although we may forget much that we did before, we still have something of the revolutionary fire in us.

I venture to say that many of us know a little more about the Indian people, about those poor people, about those peasants than some other who talk about peasants. We have spent a good deal of our lives with those peasants and poor people, and it does not besave any person to talk of money-bags, in the sense of referring to our party or to our Government.

I made that statement in Bombay, a simple statement, if I may say so, to give an assurance that this was not a final thing; a statement which said, "Let peace be restored first and then this matter may be decided calmly". I do not mind which way it is decided. I am perfectly prepared to plead the

cause of Maharashtra with others. 'Animus' is a big word. I have no disinclination to Maharashtra, but 'animus' is a big word. I do attach much importance to this question being solved in a calm manner so as not to leave any head-ache behind.

I do not entirely agree with all that Shri Patil said; I agree with much but I do not agree with something that he said. But I say that the main thing is that if you do something with Bombay this way or that way and as a result give head-ache to that party, the Maharashtra, it will do little good to Maharashtra to get that head-ache. By all means, let it get it in a friendly way, in a co-operative way, and it will be good for Maharashtra, it will be good for Bombay, and good for the country. That was the trouble I had in the way to do these things.

I do venture to submit not in this matter only but in almost every matter in an individual's life or in a national life, that the older I grow, the more I feel that what is more important is the manner things are done than the things themselves. Means are more important than ends. More and more I feel that. All our trouble in this business has been not that the ends were not good but the means employed somehow tarnished the ends, made difficulties and actually came in the way of achievement of those ends. That has been the difficulty. I am not blaming anybody. If I am to blame, I am quite prepared to blame myself. It is not a question of blaming anybody, but I believe it is a fact that if you employ the wrong methods and gain something, that end is perverted. Other considerations come in, passions come into play. Because of this difficulty I wanted this question to be considered in a calmer atmosphere. The more I thought, the more I felt it was good to postpone this particular decision for some time. I say five years, but I am not making any rigid limit. That, oddly enough—what is called the crucial decision—was, apart from being a repetition of what I said, an indication that our minds are not closed on this, an indication that this is not a finality that is coming in, but that the matter is left open for the future and whenever opportunity arises, it can be done. It was, to my humble thinking, a hand spread out to Maharashtra instead of against them, and, if I may say so,—I do not know if it is quite proper for me to say so—the day before I made that statement in the All India Congress Committee, I had the privilege of meeting quite a number of leading gentlemen from Maharashtra—I do not say they all represented Maharashtra, but some did—and we talked about these matters. I told them my difficulties and said "This Bill is there, what can we do about it?". I said that we can see that this matter is not closed, but is opened after a period. Then they said, "Can you not make your statement in the All India Congress Committee?" I said "Certainly" and I made that statement.

It is not conveying any firm decision of Government as such or that the Cabinet and the Government have decided it. I made a statement. I know that when a Prime Minister makes a statement, it is an important thing, it is not a casual thing. That statement itself, if you examine it, was "the door being left open" and that there is no finality about it, it can be varied, it could have been varied slightly here or there, if you accept what the Bill contains, because it refers to my talk in Bombay about the Bill, which was, of course, Government's decision, etc. In order to lessen the shock of the Bill to those who do not like it, I found a way by which this can be varied or changed a little. It is really to lessen the shock of the Bill that I did so rather than to come in the way of Maharashtra.

Some people talked about a big bilingual State, and for my part, obviously I welcome it. I do not mind if Bombay is a City State. I do not mind if any chunk of territory were to go from one side or the other. Maybe I do not have a sense of provincialism in me. I can consider

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

economic reasons, geographical reasons. Geography is important, of course. Of course, geography of little patches become less important in this age of vast travel etc. But the one thing that is really important, I feel, is this. Stress has been laid on this in the Report of the Commission—how linguistic minorities are to be treated—because it just does not matter you put your boundaries, between this and that, but they are bound to be overlapping. You can put people speaking in one language in a closed house, in a closed province. But there are bilingual areas, maybe trilingual areas, whatever the percentage may be. How are you to treat them?

The House will remember that in the Commission's Report, there is a special reference in the concluding chapter to certain measures, certain protections, certain precautions, certain assurances, certain statutory provisions so as to give them protection—protection to the linguistic minorities. Now I am anxious that this should be done, and done in the form of words. At any rate this charge has some truth and I do believe that a language is not given protection or a group representing a certain language is not given protection when it happens to be in a minority or almost equal, whatever it is. That difficulty and that complaint must be removed altogether from India and removed in a way not merely by some pious protestations but by some active and precise instructions to that effect. One cannot get rid of all the evils of this world, but anyhow one should go as far as possible to prevent this happening. If this can be done, then the linguistic complaint goes or ought to go from every part of India. If I may say so, this fact, I am told, is in the Constitution, but nonetheless I do not think everybody realises it.

I do think that all the fourteen languages mentioned in our Constitution are our national languages—not Hindi only, but all the fourteen languages. Hindi, not because of any linguistic superiority, but because it is spread over a larger area and for various reasons and facility and the rest, we have said, should be an all-India language; it should become an all-India language gradually and after a certain period for official purposes. But, all are national languages. We want to encourage them. And, I am convinced that the encouragement of one language in India leads to the encouragement of others. The outlook that we can encourage one language by crushing other is completely wrong from any point of view—literary, or linguistic point of view. In this matter, for instance, I feel that any kind of application, letter or petition of any kind can be presented to courts: it can be done in any of the fourteen languages of India and no court will reject it. It may be, of course, that the court may be unable to deal with it if it is totally unaware of it because no court can keep fourteen translators That does not matter. It is a matter of convenience. But, a court in Delhi has to accept an application put in Malayalam or Tamil or Telugu or Kannada. Let them get it translated. Maybe, it will delay matters. But it is none of your business to say that you cannot get it. It is one of our national languages.

If that is so about every language in India, it may be so especially in regard to the actual languages represented in a certain area. There should be no difficulty. Certainly those languages should be given that official position in that area, in applications and others. After all Government issues notices and others so that they may be understood. That notices is not merely to encourage or discourage a language. It should be issued in the language of that area, regardless, I say, of whether it is sixty or forty per cent.—whatever the percentage,—provided of course there are sufficient number of people to be approached in that way.

I just mentioned about the frontier. We are, as the House knows, facing

tremendous technological changes. We have got this marriage of science and technology and industry and that is producing enormous changes in the world. If you think of those changes, the problem that we face—such problems as in this particular Bill—becomes quite extra-ordinarily insignificant. Of course they have importance. I do not mean to deny it. I would beg of you to consider it in this particular context and consider the way the country is changing we are changing, what our future is going to be. I am intensely interested in the future of India; so are the Members of this House. We work for it. We may pause but India will continue. We have laid the foundation of that future today. About our future, one thing is quite certain. It is not going to be a repetition of the past. The world is changing too rapidly and it is of the utmost importance that, in building that future, we should develop this all-India outlook. The provincial outlook is not going to pay either the province much less India. We cannot have it. I may come from U.P., my ancestors might have come from Kashmir, but, I consider myself an Indian I feel that I have inherited every great deed and great tradition of India from Cape Comorin to the Himalayas. Sometimes, there are comparisons in this House that the people of this province are brave, that the others are not so brave and that the others are businessmen and these people are saudagars and so on. All this thinking which we find is unfortunately the reflex of the caste system—a bane and curse to this country which should be dealt with as such. We are too much immersed in these things. Which province is there in India, which State is there in India, which has not got a proud tradition of its own? Go to the south—the Tamils; there is a great language and there are great traditions—military and the rest. Go to Andhra—famous Andhra empires. Go to the Malayalees, go to the Kannadigas—the Vijayanagar empire. Whether you go north or south or east or west, each area, each part of India has got great traditions, great stories of the past, best culture —even military glory they have in store.

I inherit all that legacy. Do you think that I can confine myself to the story of Allahabad, although it is an ancient city, because I was born at Allahabad! I claim to have a right to the glory of Andhra, or Tamil Nad or Maharashtra or Gujarat or any part.

Maharashtra—everybody knows the vital part it has played in India's history, military way, scholarly way, literary way, in learning and in so many ways and lastly in the struggle for freedom. The Maharashtrians or Gujaratis or the Tamilians do not require protection. They are big enough. But the people who do require protection are our border people.

My hon. friend, Shri Jaipal Singh, suddenly gets excited when the word 'tribal' is mentioned. (*Interruptions.*)

Shri Jaipal Singh: I do not get excited.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: He may not get excited but I do get excited. Because, I think that we forget our responsibility, the trust that is reposed upon us by these people who do require every help and protection —not in the sense of imposing ourselves upon them but in the sense of always stretching out our hand of friendship and fellowship, to let them lead their own lives.

We have got a little trouble in the Naga land, Naga Hills. I have said before—I say here—that I admire the Nagas. I like the Nagas. I think they are among the finest citizens of India. I want to win them over. I do not want to fight them. I do not wish to interfere with them. I think that they are much more capable of managing their own affairs than I can. So that, I consider myself—and I hope every Member of this House will consider himself—to possess the legacy of this

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

great tradition of India from thousands of years, from the Himalayas down to the Cape Comorin, east or west.

We talk of geography. Geography is important and will remain important though it fades away in this air age. But geography has made India of the past, with Himalayas and the two seas surrounding. Whatever internal divisions and dissensions and conflicts we had in India in the past few thousands of years, the concept of India has remained. The concept of India, Bharat or Hindustan—call it what you like—has remained and has kept us mentally together. It mattered not so much in the old days and that is why politically we were apart. But it does matter today, in the age we live, when we must not only be integrated in that matter—that is not good enough—but we must emotionally and intellectually be integrated. The painful thing that has happened in the last few months is to display not to ourselves but to the world how we are not so integrated in our minds and hearts. We have to get over that.

Even accepting the mistakes, even accepting or realising that somebody else has committed the mistake, even accepting that the Government of India has committed the mistake, it will take time. It may be true. You can of course change the Government of India. You can change the decision—whatever it is—but keep, above all, the major thing in mind *viz*, we have to face the situation as it is today and how we can preserve this big thing, that is India uninjured in any manner. If we are making any mistake today let us calmly and quietly deal with it sometime later.

As for Bombay, I understand, I concede, the logic, the fairly strong logic. The logical aspect on behalf of Maharashtra, I do not deny. There are logical arguments on the other side too. Maybe, one is more powerful than the other. But, I look at it in the context of the present moment, after we have arrived through a devious and tortuous way, at a certain position. How are we to deal with it? Are we to go on quarrelling and quarrelling about that or allow matters to settle down and deal with it in a proper way? According to our Constitution, it is always open to this House to deal with a matter whenever it chooses and, apart from that, we purposely say that we are not limiting this, we are not making it absolutely final; the thing will be open and in the meanwhile let us keep as many bonds as possible to prevent this kind of thing happening.

One thing I do not know yet. The hon. Member, Shri C. D. Deshmukh, called my attention to a couplet, an Urdu couplet. I think it was from a Pakistan poet.

Shri S. S. More: Has poetry any barriers?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Poetry has no barriers; ought to have none—certainly—but I cannot quite understand what he was referring to when he talked about:

चूस लेते हैं खून, लूट लेते हैं बेवाओं का घर

I really do not understand what this has got to do—the widows being deprived of their houses—with the States Reorganisation Bill. Does he suspect that this is going to happen in some parts of India—Maharashtra, Bombay, Gujarat or anywhere? I just do not quite follow, nor do I follow what this argument had to do with the socialist pattern of society. It seems to me that many of these difficulties and many of these confusions are due to certain fixed wrong assumptions. When you get a wrong assumption in your mind then all things flow from it which have no bearing on the subject. What has socialist pattern of society got to do with this? It is said that this Bombay decision is meant to placate some

people in Bombay. Well, I cannot look into the hearts of the rich or other people, but I can tell you—and honestly—that it never struck me that this decision has anything to do with that with which other people aim that to be. And I do not see how their riches are going to be protected by this decision or otherwise, to put it in the other way, how their riches are going to be spoiled if Bombay goes to Maharashtra. I do not quite understand. I think they are capable of looking after themselves even if they are in Maharashtra and equally otherwise. It does not make the slightest difference to them. It may be, of course, that Government's policy is such as affects them; that is a different matter; but whether they are in Maharashtra, Gujerat or Bombay, it makes no difference to the position. So I submit that these questions should be considered apart from these extraneous matters.

Now, I am very reluctant to indulge well, in quoting poetry as my hon. friend did; but since he said so much about this may I also quote—it is a fairly well-known couplet:

हम आह भी करते हैं तो हो जाते हैं बदनाम,
वह कत्ल भी करते हैं तो चर्चा नही होता ।

श्री बाडगोल (पूना-मध्य) : यही तो बम्बई में हुआ है । ज़रा एनक्वायरी (जांच) तो कीजिए कि बम्बई में क्या हुआ है । अगर कुछ एन्क्वायरी करेंगे, तो पता लगेगा कि अमृतसर में जो ओडायर ने किया था, वह उसके मुकाबले में कुछ नहीं था, जो कि बम्बई में हुआ है ।

Shri Jaipal Singh: Sir, there might be a very serious misunderstanding if I were not to ask the Leader of the House for a little bit of clarification about something in which some of us are vitally interested. He said something—I welcome the assurance; how strong that assurance is yet to be seen when the Bill progresses—in regard to safeguards to linguistic minorities. He specifically mentioned 14 languages as being the national languages. Are they the national languages; that is to say, are the linguistic safeguards to be restricted only to these 14 languages, or will they be applicable to languages outside these 14 languages? That is really a very important issue.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I hope the hon. Member does not want me to be a little precise about it, but if he is referring to.....

Shri Jaipal Singh: Tribal languages

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: ..... tribal languages, I can tell him that our present policy is to encourage them in every way, both educationally and linguistically, in notifications etc.

Acharya Kripalani (Bhagalpur cum Purnea): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have spoken on this subject on two occasions in this House and on both those occasions I have made my position clear. Unfortunately it is not the position that any party, whether the Congress or the party to which I belong, the Communist Party or the Jan Sangh, has taken. From the very beginning I said that in a complicated question like this the report of the Committee should be accepted. If it had been accepted, we would not have heard from the Prime Minister today that wherever we touch this scheme we prove to be wrong, we create more problems than we seek to solve. I also said that this question was being given the present shape because we were not true to our people, that it was our own creation, the creation of the leaders of the people, the educated classes and the politicians. Today I heard Shri Deshmukh saying the same thing. Strangely enough Shri Patil also said the same thing. I suppose when Shri Deshmukh said it he was thinking of politicians in Gujerat and when Shri Patil talked of it he was thinking in terms of politicians in Maharashtra. I do not suppose they were thinking of themselves, that they have also equally contributed to this confusion.

[Acharya Kripalani]

We are all responsible for it because I say that today it seems to me that, there is only one patriotism in India and that is provincial patriotism and we all more or less suffer from it. A Committee was appointed to go into the draft Bill and I was put on that Committee. It was for the first time that I was, in all these years, put on a Committee. and, I did not know the procedure followed in these Committees!

5 P.M.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: That is why you never spoke.

Acharya Kripalani: I will tell you why I did not speak. This was a very complicated question. Complex and complicated questions are not settled *ad hoc*. If a Committee has to do its business, it must enunciate some principles by which decisions are to be taken. It must enunciate some principles in the light of which discussion is to take place. When I raised this question I was told that no principles could be enunciated for all these complicated questions and decisions thereon. Of course, the Chairman conducted the proceedings very ably and with great good humour. He allowed everybody to have his say and did not interfere. What I saw was that it was not a committee meeting but a meeting where there was a repetition of the speeches that were made here.

Another thing that surprised me this was perhaps it may be customary great latitude was given to those who wanted to speak; but I also found that some activity from the whip of the Congress was going on all the time. I do not know whether it is customary in a committee meeting for whips to be active.

Shri S. S. More: No, no.

Acharya Kripalani: The major questions at issue were not touched at all. The Prime Minister has told us that he as Prime Minister has a right to make announcements. I thought every Member of this House and for that matter, every citizen of India has a right to make any announcement that he wants to make. But the misfortune is that people suppose that when Prime Minister has spoken, no dog need bark. They think that the last word has been said. I must say that in the Committee also there was that atmosphere, namely, that the last word had been said and that there was no use discussing questions and deciding upon them. It is not the Prime Minister's fault; of course, as the Prime Minister, he has to make announcements and I do not blame him for it. But I blame those who think that because a word has been spoken, therefore, they should think of it no more and that they should close their brains. That is the difficulty. People have grown used to it. It is not the Prime Minister's fault. It is the fault of those who think that they need not use their brains when the Prime Minister has made an announcement.

As a matter of fact, I had no intention to speak again, having spoken twice on this subject, but I speak because of what my colleague Shri Asoka Mehta said on the last occasion. He made an appeal to the House—an impassioned appeal, an eloquent appeal—but he did not draw any conclusion from that appeal. He said that people's tempers were frayed; there is emotional excitement; there is passion; that events have taken place that have made groups of people to hate each other. All these things are there. Our Prime Minister has said that these are complicated questions and they can be decided in a clam atmosphere. I submit that let these proposals be dropped for the time being till we have a calm atmosphere. I am at one with the Prime Minister when he says that some Members of this House some of us have been in the revolutionary movement. If we have been in the revolutionary movement, Sir, let us show that we are revolutionary yet. Let us show that having gone to the brink we can retreat and we can

retreat with honour. We can say that we will allow this country some time to reconsider the matter again calmly. Why should we say that Bombay alone should wait for five years? Why not have six months more so that we can consider the whole question *de novo*? Why not we stop here? Since bad blood has been created, since we have begun to hate each other, since some groups do not and cannot tolerate other groups, since there is so much suspicion, since it is supposed that some money-bags are ruling this country, why not we stop here? Further there is an idea that if there is rioting, Government will be obliged to do what is wanted. All these suspicions exist and these suspicions are very plain from the speeches that have been made here.

When Shri Asoka Mehta was speaking, I thought that the House appreciated what he said; but he avoided drawing conclusions. If five years are required for calming down, as Shri S. K. Patil said, and that the question of Bombay can be decided then, I say that for the country to calm down it is necessary that we have time. When we talk of Bombay, they say we must have time. But it is not only the question of Bombay. It is the question of Punjab, it is the question of Bihar, it is the question of Bengal and there are many small disputes about other territories which do not get adequate utterance in this House. They exist and they excite the feelings of the people. Every feeling is not ventilated here. Every little bit of country that is supposed to belong to one State and has been put into another State will not find adequate expression here. So, I say that there is nothing lost and everything will be gained if we allow passions to subside, if we allow a calm atmosphere to be created and we postpone this problem till then. After all, we have been living under the old arrangements for more than a century. Can we not live under it for a few years more? When the present atmosphere is cleared, when passions have subsided, when we can think coherently, when we do not speak at each other and when we do not go on criticising each other, when we do not taunt each other—I have heard here several speakers taunting other speakers who happen to have other views than their own—when we have stopped this taunting, when we have stopped these excited speeches, when we are in a calmer atmosphere, then we can come together and sit together and decide these questions.

I will therefore appeal to the Prime Minister and to the Home Minister that, while they do belong to the revolutionary group, and they have done great things in their lives, they should show their revolutionary spirit today. It requires courage to do so, having come so far. And yet, because the circumstances demand it, let them take courage in both hands. There will be criticism. But let them say, "We will postpone this for twelve months and in these twelve months we will try to meet each other; try to find out what is the common measure of agreement and find some way by which this bad blood that has been created will not be created again." Allow some time and allow some opportunity for sanity to prevail. After all, as the Prime Minister has said, there has to be a union of hearts. There has to be a co-ordination of the brains, and there has to be a co-ordination of hearts. But the co-ordination of the brain and heart takes time. It cannot be manufactured in a day. If we stop here, nothing will be lost and I say not only nothing will be lost but so far as the Congress is concerned, it will gain very much, from a selfish point of view also. There will be no harm done if this question is postponed.

Therefore, I appeal to those who are sponsoring this Bill and to the Treasury Benches that they may give a little respite to the country. They should give the people time to think and cool their brains and to get out of the hatred and the bad blood that have been created. Then we can again sit together and think over this pro-

[Acharya Kripalani.]

them. I hope my appeal to the Treasury Benches and the House will not go in vain.

Col. Zaidi (Hardoi Distt.-North-West *cum* Farrukhabad Distt.—East *cum* Shahjahanpur Distt.—South): Mr. Speaker, I have prided myself on being an incurable optimist so far as the future of my country is concerned. I have full faith in the good sense, good humour and the broad-mindedness of my people. Yet, the happenings of the last few months, I must say, are very depressing. One feels greatly dejected. The States reorganisation has created something of a crisis in the country. A crisis only exposes certain weaknesses in our national life. A crisis does not create weaknesses, it only brings them to the surface. What is the weakness that our national life is suffering from? It seems that we are, as the Prime Minister said, lacking in emotional integration in our country. We still continue to be divided, it seems, horizontally, vertically and diagonally and continue to be sectional in our outlook.

There was a time when we were faced with the question of the partition of the country. The Muslim League had raised the cry of Pakistan. The people of Pakistan, one cannot deny, are the flesh of our flesh, and the blood of our blood. But, what started as a bargaining counter ended in deep-seated mistrust and bitterness and due to selfish calculated interests and lust of power, ended in the preposterous theory of two nations. We witnessed the partition of our country. After the country was divided, some of us sat back and heaved a sigh of relief and said, "now our troubles are over, we are going to see an era of Nation-State ushered in." But the Nation-State has not been ushered in, because the problem in our country is not communalism, but sectionalism. We do not think as a nation, as a people. We think sectionally. I am sorry to say that even some of the tallest amongst us, when it comes to mental and emotional stature, behave like pigmies, and think of their constituencies, of their districts and of their States rather than of India.

An Hon. Member: And also caste.

Col. Zaidi: It is like birds sitting on the branches of a tree, quarrelling over their respective perches while the tree is rotting. If the tree rots, how can the birds live? Who lives if India dies? What is Maharashtra or Gujerat or Bengal or Bihar if India is weakened in the process? We derive our strength from India.

I started by saying that there seems to be a complete lack of emotional integration. Are we to blame the people of India? We think in terms of our valleys and rivers; we go in for river valley projects. We think in terms of our iron ore and manganese ore. We think in terms of steel plants and factories and industrialisation But, we do not think sufficiently in terms of the 37 crores of the people in this country. The Prime Minister said that he had inherited the glory and splendour of Andhra, Tamil Nad and Malayalam. I have been trying to put a book in the hands of my children which would make them feel the inheritors of the glory and splendour of Andhra and Tamil Nad. I am sorry to tell you that I have failed to find a single book of history which would make my children as proud of the glorious traditions of the south as of the north. No history book that I can put into the hands of my children talks of Bengal as a land of culture and as a mighty contributor to the stream of Indian greatness. If after nine years of freedom we have not succeeded in producing a history book for our children which would make them emotionally integrated, why blame the people? I feel that we as a people, we as a Parliament, and the Government itself, have done precious little to prepare the people emotionally

before embarking on the reorganisation of States. You do not start the Bhakra Dam without a tremendous amount of preliminary preparation —you train the river, change its course, you make buffer dams, you do a hundred and one things before you start the actual construction of the dam. But we have done precious little to impart to our people the feeling, and consciousness of the oneness of this country, that all of us are children of India. It matters little whether one little bit of the country is governed by the people forming the Government of Maharashtra or Gujerat or Bihar or Bengal.

श्रीमती तारकेश्वरी सिन्हा (पटना पूर्व) : यू० पी० वालों की यह समझ में नहीं आयेगा ।

Col. Zaidi: If it were only the question of Bombay, one would not be so distressed. After all, Bombay is a very mighty, flourishing, prosperous, advanced city in this country. We are all proud of Bombay. If people were quarrelling over Bombay, one can understand. But, people are quarrelling about small bits of territory. The Biharis say, we shall not give up even one inch of land. The Bengalis say, we shall not be content with what is being offered to us, we claim much more. Here is a head on collision. How in the name of reason is there going to be a solution?

Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha: There is, by reasonable approach.

Col. Zaidi: There is no reason. We just exploit democracy for selfish ends. This is all nonsense. Who cares in the country—the villagers, the people at large, the workers or labourers—who cares whether he is in Bihar or Bengal. Some of us do: those who are educated. But, I have a suspicion that we are exploiting democracy for narrow selfish ends. There is nothing else; there is anyhow very little else. It does not matter how much hon. Members in this House talk about this or that. But, the underlying motives are generally the desire to get in somewhere, to get power.

Therefore, first, prepare the country emotionally. Secondly, you have big things in front of you, the prosperity of the people, the strengthening of India, making it great morally, economically, industrially and otherwise. Are you going to waste your breath, time and resources on these petty issues? Therefore, the solutions, as they appear to me, are only two. Either we take a broader view of things and realise that without a spirit of compromise and accommodation there is no future for our country, that we are faced with great danger and unless we learn a spirit of toleration and mutual accommodation and some sort of compromise there shall be no solution; or, we decide to leave things to someone in whom we have reasons to have full trust. There is talk of animus. There may be some animus somewhere against someone, but I hope I am not only speaking for the Members of the Congress Party and I think I am right in saying that 99 per cent of the people all over the country, East, West, North and South, be they Congressmen, Communists or Socialists, have full faith in the Prime Minister or rather Jawaharlal Nehru's impartiality, his sense of fairplay, his complete indifference to narrow considerations or parochial interests. Either we should make him the arbiter and say: "We cannot agree. Unfortunately there are deep-seated differences among us: So we shall by what you decide"; or abandon this sorry scheme of things entirely, and as Acharyaji said postpone it, not for one year, because that is too short a period and at the end of 12 months you will have the same sort of squabbles and bitterness and unpleasantness and rancour that we witness today, but postpone it for five years. It should be taken up at the end of the Second Five Year Plan, or after two Five Year Plans. Postpone it for ten years. There are much more important things, issues that are really momentous which matter to

[Col. Zaidi]

the poor, toiling millions of India. They are not interested in this petty, foolish, silly squabble about States reorganisation.

Shri B. S. Murthy: On a point of order. Petty, foolish, silly reorganisation. Are they parliamentary for a committee appointed by Parliament?

Mr. Speaker: The House has approved of the principle of the Bill and sent it also to the Joint Committee. We are now going on with it. These expressions need not have been used. At the outside when we were discussing the S.R.C. Report many things might have been said. It is not right therefore now to say that no action ought to be taken. We have taken a particular decision. And to say that the decision is silly etc.—all that need not have been said. Very well.

Col. Zaidi: I started by saying that if we cannot agree, we should leave it to a person whom we can all trust for his impartiality and fairmindedness.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: On a point of order. You said that we have accepted the principle, but on a previous occasion when we started a discussion there was the question whether the previous stage would be taken as consideration stage or whether we were merely joining in sending the Bill to the Joint Committee. At that time our contention was that we had considered it, but you were considerate enough to say that we had not considered it. Therefore, there is no considered opinion on the part of this House on this question and we have not considered it.

Mr. Speaker: I am afraid the hon. Member is making a confusion. I will clear it up. If I am wrong, I will certainly get myself corrected. There is a difference between sending a Bill to a Joint Committee by the House where the Bill is initiated and its being sent by the other House. If the Bill is introduced here and sent to the Joint Committee of both the Houses, the other House which goes into the Bill is not committed to the principles of the Bill. Likewise, if this Bill had originated in the Rajya Sabha and sent to us—there have been earlier rulings on this point—this House is not committed because the Bill was not introduced here. But that is not the case so far as this Bill is concerned. The Bill was introduced here. We sent it to the Joint Committee, and therefore we are committed to the principle of the Bill, though the other House might not be committed. When it goes there, they may once again reopen it. We have been proceeding on that principle.

The hon. Member may continue.

Col. Zaidi: We have accepted the principle of the proposals. There is no question of doubt about that. But I said that if we cannot agree among ourselves, especially if our friends from Maharashtra and Gujarat cannot agree, let them leave it to the Prime Minister of India, and let us leave the matter to the Prime Minister; in other words, let us accept the proposal which has been placed before us, because that has received his blessing. If we cannot agree, let us trust to the wisdom and sagacity and the good sense of the national leaders, or discuss the differences among ourselves and bring about such changes as may be possible. But all I want is that we may have the bitterest debate in this House, but let us talk as brothers in a house, not as strangers or aliens from outside. I feel unhappy when I see that one Member addresses another, not as a brother inside the House, but as someone who is an alien, who has come from outside. We are all brothers. So, in our debates and discussions, we should be animated by the spirit of brotherliness. I hope that these undue and unjustified suspicions will be given up, and it will be realised that in the wider interests of India, we should not weigh so much these petty considerations and small things. If something is not to our heart's desire, there is an offer that things can be changed. In a democracy, everything can be changed in course of time. Especially, in

the case of Bombay, a specific assurance has been given that in five years' time or even less, the people can express their own decision as to the future of that State.

In the light of all this, I hope better sense will prevail and we shall work and talk and decide issues in a spirit which is truly Indian and not parochial.

Several Hon. Members rose—

Mr. Speaker: Now, Shri Ramachandra Reddi:

I propose to call the Minister of Home Affairs tomorrow, because hon. Members wanted an extension of time for the general discussion. I shall give opportunities to as many hon. Members as possible. One hon. Member wants to speak on Maharashtra, another on Andhra, and so on.

Shri Radha Raman (Delhi City): Delhi also should be given a chance.

Shri B. D. Pande (Almora Distt.—North-East): Himalayas also.

Mr. Speaker: From each State, hon. Members will be given opportunities to speak.

Shri D. C. Sharma (Hoshiarpur): I want to speak about Punjab.

Shri L. Jogeswar Singh: Manipur also may be given a chance.

Mr. Speaker: I shall call as many Members as possible, excepting those who have already spoken.

Shri B. S. Murthy: On a point of information. There are Members who have not participated in the debate on States' reorganisation, ever since it has been started. Could you not give opportunities to those Members to express themselves?

Mr. Speaker: If the House so likes, we can sit for half an hour or an hour more, that is, up to seven o'clock.

An Hon. Member: Why not tomorrow?

Shri D. C. Sharma: I want to speak about Punjab.

Mr. Speaker: Punjab is one of the States contemplated in this Bill.

Shri R. D. Misra: I also want to speak on the all-India level.

Mr. Speaker: I shall give opportunity to the hon. Member also who raises points of order and points of law.

Shri Kanavade Patil: We should sit for some time more.

Dr. Rama Rao (Kakinada): Are we having general debate tomorrow also?

Mr. Speaker: I shall call upon the Home Minister tomorrow. There are as many as 131 clauses. Once again, with respect to everyone of those clauses, we shall have the same discussion in respect of each State. So, I shall allow hon. Members, who have not participated at all so far in the discussion here, to have their say on the various clauses.

Shri Raghavachari (Penukonda): Is it your observation that the Home Minister will be the first to be called tomorrow?

Mr. Speaker: Yes.

Shri Khardekar (Kolhapur *cum* Satara): I hope you will give enough time for the clauses.

Mr. Speaker: It is only for that purpose, that I am closing the general discussion now.

Shri Ramachandra Reddi (Nellore): Despite the elaborate thinking and statesmanship on the part of the party in power, it is very unfortunate that the troubles, controversies and bickerings between States and States and individuals and individuals are still continuing. We have the sorry state of Bombay, the controversy between Bombay and Maharashtra,

[Shri Ramachandra Reddi]

ween Bengal and Bihar, and between Bihar and Orissa and so on and so forth. At this stage, there is a serious proposal from certain friends that the entire proposal of having the States' reorganisation be shelved for another ten years. I am unable to follow them or to understand them, because for the last ten months or so elaborate discussions have been allowed in this House and a very representative Joint Committee has gone into the several aspects of the Bill and there is not much reason or foresight in saying that the entire matter should be postponed for another decade or so. The Bombay-Maharashtra controversy has cost us not only several lives but also several rounds of ammunition, and more than that, we have lost the services of a very eminent and able Finance Minister; a person, who is ordinarily and normally sweet, has been driven to bitterness. Unfortunately, that shows up the present trend of democracy in the Republic of India. It is, therefore, unnecessary to think of retracing our steps. I would only strongly advise the Government not to yield to that caution or advice. We have suffered much and we do not want to suffer more by postponing the consideration of the present Bill.

While sending the Bill to the Joint Committee, the hon. Home Minister said that with regard to the question of Bellary, the Andhras had been very greedy. There is absolutely no question of greediness because Andhras already do possess a very large and prosperous territory. Also they have large commitments to go through, namely, improving the backward areas in the existing Andhra State as well as in the Telangana area. But it was the will of the Bellary people that made the Andhras feel that their case must be presented before the House properly and efficiently. It looks as if the question of Bellary has not been taken up at all in the Joint Committee. I do not see any reason why the matter has received such scant courtesy there, though there were one or two hon. members from that area on the Committee.

We might remember that one member from Bellary, who originally belonged to the Madras State and now shifted on to Mysore State, had resigned and challenged a bye-election. A bye-election was held and in the bye-election, the challenge of Shri Gangappa was thrown out. But there seem to be several reasons for this. It is not as if the election had been conducted in a free and fair manner. There are reports that there has been direct or indirect interference by the Mysore Government, and that partiality has been shown towards the Kannada candidate as against the Andhra candidate. In several places, especially the three areas which have been agitating for being retained with Andhra, the majority of the votes have been in favour of Shri Gangappa, the Andhra candidate. I hope you will kindly excuse me if I go into details. In Bellary town alone where 23,440 votes had been polled, Shri Gangappa got more than 15,638 votes and the Kannada candidate got 7,802. In Ravinguda taluk, the total is 6,062 and Gangappa gets 3,141 and the Kannada candidate gets 2,921. In Moka out of a total of 7,734 votes, Mr. Gangappa gets 3,547 and the Kannada candidate gets 4,217. In this place. the Andhra candidate gets 670 votes less. That only indicates how strong is the feeling in those areas that they should be tacked on to Andhra and not retained in Mysore.

It is reported that the Mysore Government or the Congress party in Mysore has not put up a Congress candidate for this bye-election. The reasons are very obvious because they want to avoid the defeat of a Congress candidate because a Congress candidate will be considered as the Government candidate and as such his defeat would mean the defeat of the Government itself. On the other hand, it is to be noticed that if a

Congress candidate is put up, naturally Government will have to support him. But, without undergoing any such difficulty, they simply put up an independent candidate and the Congress worked for him.

The methods that seem to have been adopted are these. Up-to-date Telugu lists were not made available and the Kanarese voters' list alone was made available. The Telugu lists were very old ones belonging to 1951, 1952, or 1953. In the polling stations where the Telugu voters were larger in number, the polling was closed at 3-30 or 4-00 p.m. whereas it ought to be kept open till 5 o'clock. It is also said that separate chits were given to the Andhra and Kannada voters. The Kannada voters were given green chits while the Andhra voters were given white chits. Green chits were preferred in allowing entry into the polling booths. Secrecy does not seem to have been kept very much and there are also a few report about police excesses in certain areas where it was found that the largest amount of support was not forthcoming for the Mysore condidate.

These are a few instances which came to my notice and I only suggest that the matter should not be left there and Government should more deeply consider this matter....

Shri B. S. Murthy: What about money-bags?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Let those be emptied now.

Shri Ramachandra Reddi: It is therefore very necessary that Government should not leave this matter at that stage. In fact, some of us have given notice of amendments and if Government makes up its mind to accept the amendments there will be no future trouble. It should not be considered that because Bellary won't be able to fight as Bombay or Maharashtra is doing now, the cause of Bellary should be forgotten. The case of Bellary is sound; and, I am sure, if, in any case, Bellary's interests are turned down in the manner they are being done, Bellary will not lag behind in showing to Government its valour also as Maharashtra did.

It will be noticed in the Bill that the formation of a Second House has been agreed upon with regard to Maharashtra, and as regards Madhya Pradesh and Andhra, they are asked to take the opinion of the local Legislature to be formed later on and that they should form the Upper House on the strength of the vote of those two Legislatures. I do not see any reason why a particular method that is good for Maharashtra should not be applied to Andhra and Madhya Pradesh. It is not as if Andhra has not been accustomed to the Second House. As long as it was a part of the undivided Madras, it was enjoying the privilege of a Second House. Now in view of the fact that Telangana was going to be tacked on to Andhra, the question of forming a second House then and there was evidently postponed. The postponement does not mean complete avoidance of it. If it is good for Maharashtra, it must be good also for Madhya Pradesh and Andhra. I leave it at that and would only appeal to the goodwill of the Government to agree to the formation of the Second House in those two States also, and especially in Andhra, which has become very big and which has very grave responsibilities to discharge. If it is found that a Second House is not at all necessary under the Constitution, let it prescribe it for all the States, but if it is found good for some States, it should also be found good for these States also.

Schedule III deals with the allocation of seats in the House of the People—I have a doubt in this Schedule about a particular circumstance which I wish to be cleared—and assignment of seats to State Legislative Assemblies. There seems to be some disparity here between State and State in regard to allocation of seats in the House of the People, in comparison with the number of seats allotted in

[Shri Ramachandra Reddi]

the Assembly for those States. You will find that in Andhra Pradesh only one-seventh of the total number of Legislative Assembly Members will be members of the House of the People, in Assam only one-ninth, in Bihar one-sixth, in Gujarat one-seventh, in Kerala one-seventh, in Madhya Pradesh one-eighth, in Madras one-fifth, in Maharashtra one seventh, in U.P. one-fifth and in West Bengal one-seventh. I do not understand the disparity between the various States and why there should be any difference between one State and another with regard to the proportion of seats. If the Assembly seats have been fixed on the basis of population, the same proportion also must come to all the States together. Now the number of seats in the House of the People has been increased to 503 and in the light of that there must be some adjustment with regard to the proportion of seats to be given to each State in the House of the People.

Lastly, I wish to mention only one point. The question of boundaries is not such an easy one as it is now thought to be by the Joint Committee. They have entrusted the work to the Zonal Councils. They will not succeed in this matter. These boundary questions have become very difficult in certain places and to the extent I know, the question, though a very small one between Madras and Andhra, has not been solved in spite of several consultations and meetings between the Madras and the Andhra Ministers. It is, therefore, highly advisable and necessary that there should be a statutory boundary commission so that it might go into the relative claims more colsely and adequately. We have, all round Andhra, boundary troubles. We have got the trouble in Hosur now in Madras State; Kolar also will have to come in if the linguistic principle is conceded. Parlakimedi is another bone of contention between Orissa and Andhra. If these questions have to be decided amicably, it will not be possible for the State Governments to do so but a statutory commission would be able to do it much more quickly and more satisfactorily than the Zonal Councils.

Shri Gidwani (Thana): Sir, I believe you will agree with me that after the debate during this session on the issue of Bombay, the differences have narrowed down. I am glad that the Prime Minister made it clear today that he had no intention of taking any plebescite or referendum on this issue. He also, however, suggested that we have to consult the people within five years. He said: "Let the atmosphere cool down and let tensions ease. Then things can be reconsidered and reviewed."

The problem before is this. How can tensions be removed and a better atmosphere created, unless something is done to make people, particularly Maharashtrians feel that the issue is going to be settled to their satisfaction. As Shri Patil himself suggested, I would suggest that the shifting of the capital to somewhere else from Bombay should be avoided. It would involve huge expenditure just as in the case of Kurnool in Andhra costing so much money. I am told that the constructions there are leaking even now. But apart from that, it will not be useful. Let us not waste crores of poor tax payers' money and let Bombay be declared—I do not want to say declared—the capital or let the capital be located in Bombay. The offices may also be retained there. By doing that, we will also remove the misunderstanding from the minds of the people. Particularly, Shri Deshmukh also referred to that. By the removal of the capital from Bombay, many thousands of Government employees will have to leave and they will have to be rehabilitated. This will create a new problem and quarters may have to be built as their families will have to be accommodated. Another suspicion in their minds is that it will be

one of the ways to reduce the population of Maharashtrians. Both these things can be satisfactorily settled if we have the offices of Maharashtra located in Bombay so that the employees will not be unsettled. They will remain there and the fear, that the population of Maharashtrians will be reduced, will also be removed.

The other thing is, we must also make a provision in the statute about the procedure by which Bombay will be merged with Maharashtra so that the people should have a clear picture before them and there will be no occasion to have any misunderstanding in their minds about their future status.

Besides that, I would also suggest that speedy action should be taken with regard to these steps. If speedy action is not possible in taking these steps, then we must postpone consideration of the Bill as Acharya Kripalani said. We must not proceed with the present decision that we have arrived at. It will be a wrong thing. It will not achieve the object that we have in view. Shri Patil, Shri C. C. Shah and Shri Asoka Mehta said so. Everybody is agreed that the present decision about Bombay, if it is carried out as it is today, is not going to create a better atmosphere. It is not in the interests of Bombay, it is not in the interests of Maharashtra and it is also not in the interests of India. Therefore, that factor must be kept in view, that factor must be seriously considered, that factor cannot be ignored and that factor has to be taken into consideration by the Government of India before coming to a final decision.

Then, I do not think there is any argument about the feelings of Maharashtrians on this issue. Even the Prime Minister said, there can be the other side of the question but there are weighty reasons why Bombay should be merged in Maharashtra. He did not argue like those who said that Bombay is not a part of Maharashtra geographically. Everybody admits, more or less, that it is a part of Maharashtra and it is only a question of when to merge Bombay with Maharashtra. Sir, I was reminded of a Persian story when my Province Sind was being separated from Bombay or when India was being partitioned. When I was studying 4th Year English—I was a student of Persian—the first story in the book called Miquat-e-Latif was this:

"दोजन दरतिफली मुनाजियत मीकरदन्द हुर्दपीस काजी रफ्तन व इंसाफ खास्तन काजी अल्लाद रातसबीद व गुफ्त कि ईं तिफ्लरा दो पारहकुन मादरे तिफल फरियाद कर्द व गुफ्त के बराये खुद। तिफ़्ले मरा पाराह पाराह मकुन'

I will give you its English translation also. "Two women were quarrelling over a child each claiming it to be her own. Both went to a judge and demanded justice. In those days the Kazis were very wise. The Kazi wanted to test the real mother. He called the hangman or the butcher and asked him to cut the child into two pieces. He knew that if such an order was given the real mother would cry. So when this order was given one woman began to say: 'For God's sake do not cut my child into two pieces". Similarly, whether you agree or disagree, whether you consider it right or wrong, here is Shri C. D. Deshmukh, here is Shri Pataskar, here is Shri Karve who is 99 years old, here is Shri Jayakar, here is Shri Paranjpye, Congressmen, socialists and social reformers, everybody thinks that by separating Bombay you are cutting their mother Maharashtra into pieces and they cry:

"बराये खुदा मादरे मरा पाराह पाराह मकुन"

"For God's sake do not cut our mother into pieces" that is what they say. Now that feeling has to be reckoned with. Here are 3½ crores of your countrymen who are feeling like that. We do realise that the feeling is not unjustified. We do feel that it is

[Shri Gidwani]

based on reason and it is based on facts of geography. Of course, there may be other side of the picture, but we have already admitted that it is not unjustified. Therefore, I would appeal to the Government to take this factor into consideration and find out ways and means to arrive at an early decision.

One suggestion I have made in the beginning. The other is, I would appeal to my Gujerati friends—I appeal to Shri Patil; after all, he realises today that the present decision is not going to help Bombay, that the present decision is not going to help Maharashtra, that Bombay will be in doldrums and that there will be no peace—to reconsider the question. What is the reason for not their sitting together and settling the issue? I asked my Gujarti friends, this question, last time also. Last time I made an appeal to them. If Bapu were here, I told them, things would have been different. I am a humble worker. I have been working for the national cause for the past 49 years. I started my activities in May, 1907 with the deportation of Lala Lajpat Rai. My body has not worn a yard of foreign cloth since then. It is now 49 years since I joined public life. I knew Bapu. I met him in 1915—December, 1915 to be exact, and on that unfortunate day also, when he was assassinated, I was here. I know what he would have said on this occasion if he were alive. I need not mention much about him now because he is not living. But all Gandhites and all Bhoodanists regard Shri Vinobha Bhave as the spiritual heir of Mahatma Gandhi. Shri Vinobha Bhave has said that Bombay belongs to Maharashtra, and he will leave it to the Gujaratis to decide it. That was the Bhoodan way of approaching the problem. May I not appeal to Shri C. C. Shah and other Gujarati friends to consider this matter? After all, if this question is to be settled tomorrow, if this is a question to be decided after two or three years, why not do it now? Where will all the arguments and all the fears expressed here by them go after two years when Government decides that Bombay shoud merge with Maharashtra?

The Prime Minister said that he is not in favour of a referendum or a plebiscite. Then may I ask him, if a thing is to happen after two or three years and that it is bound to happen, why not let us do it today, in good grace. It is the Gandhian way. It is the correct way. We shall thus be giving a lead to the whole country, but if, for any reasons, this cannot be done now then I echo the appeal of Shri Asoka Mehta and others, namely, let us stand for a bigger bilingual State of Maharashtra and Gujarat together. If one cannot accept either of these suggestions, then I am afraid we are not doing service to the country. We are not standing by the ideal that we have been preaching.

Our country was partitioned. I am today a stateless person. Lakhs of people are still on the streets even though nine years have passed since partition. I shall just tell you of an instance which is sorrowful and heart-rending. A person came to me the other day. He belongs to that part of Jammu and Kashmir State—which is now under Pakistan's possession. He was an old man of 70. His daughter is still in Pakistan. He said that she came here for some days and again ran away or she was taken away.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: Abducted.

Shri Gidwani: Whatever it is. One can imagine the feelings of those who have lost their all, lost their home, lost their property, lost their girls. Yet, people here are quarrelling over bits of land, over the border lines of States! The Prime Minister said that we should forget those things. We have forgotten. We are here working for the future. Why not they show some generosity over this Bombay, issue? I appeal to Shri C. C. Shah and Shri Dabhi, particularly my Gujarati

friends. After all, Gujarat has become great as a result of the Swadeshi movement which was started by Lokmanya Tilak. All factories, all mills, today are producing cloth as a result of the great Swadeshi agitation. Then Gujarat became greater when it produced Gandhi. Saurashtra and Gujarat are proud that they produced the greatest son of India, the greatest man of the world. What was his message? It was "sacrifice, sacrifice, sacrifice".

I related an incident on the last occassion when I spoke and I shall repeat it now. Once Gandhiji came to Sind. He was touring with me in connection with Lala Lajpat Rai Memorial Fund. He told me that he wanted to collect money. I requested him to visit Sind at the time of the Calcutta Congress. He told me: "I will come to Sind if Rs. 5,000 a day are collected. I will come there on this condition that you give Rs. 5,000 a day for the Lala Lajpat Rai Memorial Fund". I replied, "I accept your fee". Of course he got in ten days Rs. 80,000, the biggest contribution from any one State for the Lala Lajpat Rai Memorial Fund. But I must tell the House that at that time many Sindis came to me and asked, "Why do you collect money for the Lajpat Rai Fund?" I said; "No, we were one nation." There is one thing more which I want to tell you. I was not then the President of the Sind Provincial Congress Committee. Another friend was President then. That friend would not hold yearly elections. I told Bapu: "This man is not holding elections." He said: "Do not quarrel. Allow him to continue. One day you will come into your own. You will become President or you will manage the affairs." That was always his message. He used to ask the party which was in majority or in power always to yield. Therefore, it is the trial of Gujarati friends and friends like Shri S. K. Patil to come together. Let us forget all that has happened during the last six months and sit together. If we can forget Pakistan and can sit together with Pakistanis and talk to them, can we not meet together and come to some settlement? It is not such an impossible task. Acharya Kripalani rightly said—and the Prime Minister said—we were revolutionaries. What is meant by a revolutionary? He takes risks. This is the time to take that risk. We must not allow the present decisions to continue, those decisions which are creating trouble in this country, which are not acceptable to the people. After all, we claim to be democrats. After all, you have seen the feeling of the Maharashtrian friends, and that feeling cannot be good. You know what happened after the partition of Bengal. It was not all people who were against the partition. Many Muslim friends were in favour of partition of Bengal. Even, all Hindus, excepting the nationalists at that time were not so vocal. Still, even the British Government annulled that partition. I do not want to give that analogy. Let us reconsider the question and review it now. Let us take some concrete steps.

6 P.M.

I repeat my suggestion. It is for Shri Patil and the Gujarati friends to see that they do not stand on prestige. I am not one of those who say that we should unnecessarily create a situation which would be a bad precedent. Yet, I do say that the situation does demand a bold step, a courageous step. Even if a little risk is involved, we must do it, but we must not do things which will create trouble.

With these words I support—there is no question of support or opposition. I do suggest to Government and particularly to my Gujarati friends to show magnanimity, to show large-heartendness and remove this impression, though it may be wrong, in the minds of the Maharashtrians that it is Gujaratis who are standing in their way.

[Shri Gidwani]

After all, who are these Maharashtrians? We have known them. I have known them. Of course, I have been returned by them. Therefore, you may say that I am a little selfish in the sense that I have been elected by them, but that showed their magnanimity. Thana, my constituency, consists of 16 lakhs of people with eight lakhs of voters and my refugee voters were only 1/14 of it. That shows, at least my experience shows me, that there is no provincialism in them. If there was any spirit of provincialism in them, they would not have elected a stranger who did not even know their language, whom they did not understand, but because of party affiliations or my previous work, they voted for me. It is a positive proof that after all Maharashtrians are not such people who will behave in a manner which will be harmful to the intersts of the minorities. I have full faith in their generosity. Trust them as Gandhiji used to say. Let us come together and forget the ugly past. Let us stand together as a united nation and worship Bharat Mata as we always used to say before the achievement of independence.

Again I appeal to my Gujarati friends and Shri Patil not to allow time to lapse, but to take some concrete, immediate steps. I would also appeal to my Maharashtrian friends not to talk in the way as if we are talking to opponents. We should talk to each other as friends. Our country is one. We are not dividing the country and throwing away any slice to any foreign country. We are part and parcel of one nation. Let us stand together particularly at this critical moment. We cannot afford to forget what is happening in the world. Our Prime Minister is trying to bring about peace in the world, but you know what has happened in Egypt. Tomorrow, something else may happen. Even in our country, you know what is happening on the Kashmir border or the Naga Hills border. These things should make us wake from our complacency; they should make us watchful and restless to see that this country stands united and goes forwards as one unit, for its good, glory and progress.

Shri B. S. Murthy: I thought I would not have the opportunity of speaking.....

Mr. Speaker: Then, the hon. Member can reserve it.

Shri B. S. Murthy: No, because I have not had the opportunity of participating in it so far.

Shri Kanavade Patil: Are we sitting up to seven o'clock?

Mr. Speaker: Yes.

Shri V. P. Nayar (Chirayinkil): Only seven O'clock.

Shri B. S. Murthy: As I have not had the opportunity of participating in any of the previous debates on this question, I must thank you for having given me this opportunity.

This question of reorganisation has been troubling the minds of all the thirty-six crores of people in India. It may be less here and more there, but all the people are being agitated over it. Especially, when we come to the question of Bombay and Maharashtra, the whole country is looking to the Maharashtrians as to what contribution they are going to make in the drawing up of the new political map of India.

In this connection, I would like to trace the history of the agitation of the Andhra, who are responsible more or less for this States' reorganisation. The Andhras were the forerunners in asking for a linguistic State. For nearly thirty five years, they had agitated, and they had done everything possible to make both the Congress High Command and Government to realise that the Andhras needed a State of their own for their cultural advancement. Finally, after the supreme sacrific of Potti Sriramulu, the Central Government thought of giving us a State. But what sort of

a State did we get? It was a truncated State.

Shri Veeraswamy: On a point of order. There is no quorum in the House.

Mr. Speaker: We are not taking any votes now.

Shri Radha Raman: Why not extend the time tomorrow?

Mr. Speaker : Hon. Members may note that there are as many as 131 clauses, and most of the clauses are clauses that relate to individual States. On those clauses, I shall certainly give opportunities to hon. Members who have not spoken so far, to speak on States on which they are interested. Now, general discussion has been going on. On Bombay, of course, we have had a lot of discussion. As for Delhi, Madhya Pradesh and so on, I shall give opportunities to as many hon. Members as possible. I shall distribute the time fairly to all of them. In fact, I am trying to extend the time for the clause-by-clause discussion from 25 hours to 30 hours. I have also appointed a sub-committee to put the various clauses into groups, so that we may dispose of them together and also allot time for them. I shall make an announcement on that now, so that hon. Members will have ample opportunities to speak on the clauses. I know every hon. Member is trying to make his own contribution. I shall never forget that. I shall do justice as much as is possible.

Shri B. C. Das (Ganjam South): What about States which are not mentioned in the Bill, as for instance, Orissa? The Members from Orissa also have their own grievances, and they want to put their case before the House.

Mr. Speaker: As for Orissa, I am calling Shri R. N. S. Deo. How is it possible to call everyone of the 499 Members?

Shri Rishang Keishing (Outer Manipur—Reserved—Sch. Tribes): What about Manipur? That is a territory.

Mr. Speaker: They are also covered by this Bill.

Shri Rishang Keishing: But none has been called from these territories so far.

Mr. Speaker: I shall call the hon. Member also, though not today, at least on the clauses.

Shri Radha Raman: I was saying that the House is very thin now, and hon. Members are feeling tired, having sat here from eleven o'clock onwards. So, I would request that if you could allot one or two or three hours tomorrow, and give opportunities to some of the other speakers who want to take part in the general discussion, that might be better.

Mr. Speaker: My difficulty is this, that it is not a question of two or three speakers. Once again, all the others who have not spoken will start a general discussion. Then on the clause-by-clause discussion, the same Members will also take part.

Shri Radha Raman: In that case, you may not allow them a second chance.

Mr. Speaker: I am not able to do that.

An Hon. Member: When do we adjourn?

Mr. Speaker: As soon as the hon Member, Shri B. S. Murthy concludes. Other hon. Members will certainly get a chance on the various clauses.

Shri R. N. S. Deo (Kalahandi-Bolangir): I want to speak.

Mr. Speaker: I have already said that Orissa will get a chance. I will allow him to speak. If the House is willing to sit, I have no quarrel. Already Shri Veeraswamy has raised a question that there is no quorum.

Shri B. S. Murthy: I was saying that Andhras had accepted a truncated State at that particular moment when the spirit of Andhras had been rouse.

Shri Feroze Gandhi (Pratapgarh Distt.—West *cum* Rae Bareli Distt. East): Up to what time are we sitting?

Mr. Speaker: Till the hon. Member concludes.

Shri Radha Raman: Why not ask him to finish tomorrow?

Some Hon. Members: That is right.

Shri Kanavade Patil: The discussion may be extended by two hours.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member can finish today. I am willing to allow all the 45 hours for general discussion only. I have made up my mind to sit. I have been doing so.

Shri Feroze Gandhi: But we have to maintain quorum.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member should not ask for it.

Shri B. S. Murthy: The Central Government said that if we raised the question of Madras, we would not get our province. We accepted that. Then when it came to the question of Bellary, it was not given to Andhras. Then when it was a question of Kolar, it was not given to the Andhras, and when it was a question of Sirivancha, it was not given to the Andhras. In the distribution of assets, Andhras were not done justice. Even on the question of a Legislative Council, the Andhars were not given one.

Dr. Rama Rao: We do not want it.

Shri B. S. Murthy: With all these defects, Andhras had accepted their State. They waited for some time. Today I think with the kind hand of God, we are getting a better capital and nearly a crore of people. I am saying all these things just to tell our Maharashtrian friends that nothing is lost if Bombay is kept away from them for five years (*Interruptions*).

An Hon. Member: Let us adjourn now.

Shri B. S. Murthy: If you give me ten minutes tomorrow, you will be doing justice to me, because everybody is anxious to go away.

Mr. Speaker: All right.

6-15 P.M.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Tuesday, the 31st July, 1956.

DAILY DIGEST

[*Monday, 30th July, 1956*]

COLUMNS

PAPER LAID ON THE TABLE. 1405

A copy of the Audit Report (Posts and Telegraphs), 1956—Part I, was laid on the Table under Article 151(1) of the Constitution.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE . . 1405-06

Nine Members were granted leave of absence from the sittings of the Lok Sabha.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE. 1406

The motion to elect two Members to serve as Members of All-India Institute of Medical Sciences was moved by the Minister of Health (Rajkumari Amrit Kaur) and the motion was adopted.

COLUMNS

BILL INTRODUCED . . . 1406-07

State Financial Corporations (Amendment) Bill was introduced.

BILL UNDER CONSIDERATION . . . . 1407—1512

Futher discussion on the motion to consider the States Reorganisation Bill, as reported by the Joint Committee, was continued. The discussion was not concluded.

AGENDA FOR TUESDAY, 31st JULY, 1956.—

Further consideration of the States Reorganisation Bill, as reported by the Joint Committee.